Bosworth Memorial Library
College of The Bible
Lexington, Kentucky

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY

—OF—

IBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS,

INCLUDING THE

APERS READ AND ABSTRACT OF PROCEEDINGS

—FOR—

JUNE AND DECEMBER, 1881.

e Society prints the papers read in full, but is not responsible for any opinions expressed therein.

Bosworth Memorial Library
College of The Bible
Lexington, Kentucky

MIDDLETOWN, CONN.:
PELTON & KING, PRINTERS AND BOOK-BINDERS.
1882.

08203

Table of Contents.

JUNE.

	Page.
On the Construction of Titus ii. 13, by Prof. E. Abbot, D. D., LL. D.,	3
. Notes on 1 Cor. vii. 15, by Prof. E. P. Gould,	20
I. On Rom. ix. 5, by Prof. Timothy Dwight, D. D.,	22
V. A Metrical Paraphrase of the Song of Deborah, Judg. v., by Prof. Thomas H. Rich,	56
. On the Babylonian Element in Ezekiel, by Prof. C. H. Toy, D. D.,	59
I. On the use of לֵב and *καρδία* in the Old and New Testaments, by Prof. D. R. Goodwin, D. D., LL. D.,	67

DECEMBER.

. On the use of *ψυχή*, *πνεῦμα* and connected words in the Sacred Writings, by Prof. D. R. Goodwin, D. D., LL. D.,	73
. Remarks on Rom. ix. 5, by Prof. E. Abbott, D. D., LL. D.,	87
II. On the Interpretation of Ex. xxxiii. 7–11, by Prof. C. M. Mead, Ph. D.,	155
V. On "Everlasting Father" in Isa. ix, 6, by Rev. T. W. Chambers, D. D.,	169
. On Ezekiel in relation to the Levitical law, by Prof. F. Gardiner, D. D.,	172

PROCEEDINGS.

une,	206
December,	209
Papers for the next Meeting,	210
List of Members,	211

ERRATA.

Page 3, note, line 8 from bottom, *for* Oldshausen *read* Olshausen

" 17, No. 6, line 2, *for* θεοῦ, τὸν *read* θεοῦ . . . τὸν.

" 34, l. 4, for *fur* read *für*, and for 1868–9 read 1869.

" 37, line 8, *for* Septugaint *read* Septuagint.

" 75, line 3 from bottom, and p. 79, line 3 from bottom, *substitute* ט *for* ט

" 89, No. 4, line 2, *for* is *read* Is

" 103, note *, *add at the end*, 1 Macc. x. 69, τὸν ὄντα ἐπὶ κοίλης Συρίας.

" 112, line 2, *for* objectionable *read* unobjectionable

" 113, No. 2, line 2, *for* 9 *read* 6

" 123, note *, last line, *for* Cap. *read* Chap.

" 127, line 8, from bottom of text, place " *after* Christ

" 134, line 7, *for* Christian writers *read* ancient Christian writers

" " " 22, *for* Cardinal Newman *read* Dr. J. H. Newman

" " " 24, *after* Pseudo-Cæsarius *add* and Methodius as Pseudo-Methodius

" 139, 4th paragraph, last line, *for* p. 126 *read* p. 126, note †.

" 140, 2d paragraph, line 5, *dele* Amphilochius. (See p. 137.)

" 143, 2d paragraph, line 8, for *chirstl.* read *christl.*

" 144, l. 21, for *Sunde* read *Sünde.*

" 146, l. 9, *for* Herrüber *read* Herr über

" " last line, *after* N. T. *add* (1832)

" 147, last line, for *Briefs* read *Briefes.*

Minor errors, e. g. in the Greek accents and breathings, the scholar will readily correct for himself.

On the Construction of Titus ii. 13.

BY PROF. EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D., CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The Greek reads as follows: *προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (*or Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*).

Shall we translate, "the appearing of the glory of *our great God and Saviour* Jesus Christ"? or, "the appearing of the glory of *the great God and our Saviour* Jesus Christ"?

It was formerly contended by Granville Sharp, and afterwards by Bishop Middleton, that the absence of the Greek article before *σωτῆρος* in Tit. ii. 13 and 2 Pet. i. 1, and before *θεοῦ* in Eph. v. 5, is alone sufficient to prove that the two appellatives connected by *καί* belong to one subject.* "It is impossible," says Middleton in his note on Tit. ii. 13, "to understand *θεοῦ* and *σωτῆρος* otherwise than of one person." This ground is now generally abandoned, and it is ad-

---

* Sharp applied his famous rule also to 2 Thess. i. 12, but Middleton thinks that this text affords no certain evidence in his favor. Winer disposes of it summarily as merely a case in which *κύριος* is used for *ὁ θεός*, the word *κύριος* taking, in a measure, the character of a proper name. In 2 Thess. i. 11, *ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν* denotes God in distinction from "our Lord Jesus" (ver. 12); it is therefore unnatural in the extreme to refer this title in the last clause of *the very same sentence* (ver. 12) as a designation of Christ. We may then reject without hesitation Granville Sharp's construction, which in fact has the support of but few respectable scholars.

As to 1 Tim. v. 21 and 2 Tim. iv. 1, it is enough to refer to the notes of Bishop Middleton and Bishop Ellicott on the former passage. Compare the remarkable various reading in Gal. ii. 20, adopted by Lachmann and Tregelles (text), but not by Tischendorf or Westcott and Hort,—*Χριστὸς ζῇ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ.*

In Eph. v. 5, *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ*, the *Χριστοῦ* and *θεοῦ* are regarded as denoting distinct subjects by a large majority of the best commentators, as De Wette, Meyer, Oldshausen, Meier, Holtzmann, Flatt, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, Ewald, Schenkel, Dune and Riddle (in Lange's *Comm.*, Amer. trans.), Conybeare, Bomfield, Ellicott, Eadie, Alford, Canon Barry in Ellicott's *N. T. Comm.*, and Prebendary Meyrick in "the Speaker's Commentary" (1881). In the Revised New Testament, the construction contended for so strenuously by Middleton in Eph. v. 5, and by Sharp in 2 Thess. i. 12, has not been deemed worthy of notice.

mitted that, *grammatically*, either construction is possible. I need only refer to Winer, Stuart, Buttmann, T. S. Green, and S. G. Green among the grammarians, and to Alford, Ellicott, Wace, and other recent commentators.† It will be most convenient to assume, provisionally, that this view is corrrect; and to consider first the *exegetical* grounds for preferring one construction to the other. But as some still think that the omission of the article, though not decisive of the question, affords a *presumption* in favor of the construction which makes τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ a designation of Christ, a few remarks upon this point will be made in Note A, at the end of this paper. It may be enough to say here, that θεοῦ has already an attributive, so that the mind naturally rests for a moment upon τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ as a subject by itself; and that the addition of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ to σωτῆρος ἡμῶν distinguishes the person so clearly from τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ according to Paul's *constant use of language*, that there was no need of the article for that purpose.

The question presented derives additional interest from the fact that, in the recent Revision of the English translation of the New Testament, the English Company have adopted in the text the first of the constructions mentioned above, placing the other in the margin; while the American Company, by a large majority, preferred to reverse these positions.

I will first examine the arguments of Bishop Ellicott for the construction which makes τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ an appellation of Christ. They are as follows:

"(*a*) ἐπιφάνεια is a term specially and peculiarly applied to the Son, and never to the Father." The facts are these. In one passage (2 Tim. i. 10) the word ἐπιφάνεια is applied to Christ's first advent; in four to his second advent (2 Thess. ii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8); and as ἐπιφάνεια denotes a visible manifestation, it may be thought that an ἐπιφάνεια of God, the Father, "whom no man hath seen nor can see," could not be spoken of.

But this argument is founded on a misstatement of the question. The expression here is not "the appearing *of the great God*," but "the appearing *of the glory* of the great God," which is a very different thing. When our Saviour himself had said, "The Son of man

†See Winer, *Gram.* § 19, 5, Anm. 1, p. 123, 7te Aufl. (p. 130 Thayer's trans., p. 162 Moulton); Stuart, *Bibl. Repos.* April, 1834, vol. iv. p. 322 f.; A. Buttmann, *Gram.*, § 125, 14–17, pp. 97–100, Thayer's trans.; T. S. Green, *Gram. of the N. T. Dialect* (1842), pp. 205–219, or new ed. (1862), pp. 67–75; S. G. Green, *Handbook to the Gram. of the Greek Test.*, p. 216; and Alford on Tit. ii. 13. Alford has some good remarks on the passage, but I find no sufficient proof of his statement that σωτήρ had become in the N. T. "a quasi proper name."

hall come *in the glory of his Father*, with his angels" (Matt. xvi. 27, omp. Mark viii. 38), or as Luke expresses it, "in his own glory, *nd* the glory *of the Father*, and of the holy angels" (ch. ix. 26), can ve doubt that Paul, who had probably often heard Luke's report of hese words, might speak of "the appearing of the *glory*" of the Father, s well as of Christ, at the second advent?*

This view is confirmed by the representations of the second advent iven elsewhere in the New Testament, and particularly by 1 Tim. i. 14–16. The future ἐπιφάνεια of Christ was not conceived of by 'aul as independent of God, the Father, any more than his first πιφάνεια or advent, but as one "which in his own time the blessed nd only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who only ath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable, whom no man ath seen nor can see, *shall show*" (δείξει). The reference is to the oint manifestation of the glory of God and of Christ at the time vhen, to use the language of the writer to the Hebrews (i. 6), "he *gain bringeth* [or *shall have brought*] the first-begotten into the world, nd saith, Let all the angels of God pay him homage." That God and Christ should be associated in the references to the second dvent, that God should be represented as displaying his power and lory at the ἐπιφάνεια of Christ, accords with the account given elsevhere of the *accompanying events*. The dead are to be raised at the econd advent, a glorious display of divine power, even as Christ is aid to have been "raised from the dead by the *glory* of the Father" Rom. vi. 4). But it is expressly declared by Paul that "as Jesus lied and rose again, even so shall God, *through* Jesus, bring with him hem that have fallen asleep" (1 Thess. iv. 14; comp. Phil. iii. 21); nd again, "God both raised the Lord, and will raise up us by his ower" (1 Cor. vi. 14). There is to be a general judgment at he second advent; but Paul tells us that "God hath appointed a day

* Even if the false assumption on which the argument is founded were correct, that is, if the expression here used were τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the argument would have little or no weight. The fact that ἐπιφάνεια is used four times of Christ in relation to the second advent, would be very far from proving that it might not be so used of God, the Father, also. Abundant examples may be adduced from Jewish writers to show that any extraordinary display of divine power, whether exercised directly and known only by its effects, or through an intermediate visible agent, as an angel, might be called an ἐπιφάνεια, an "appearing" or "manifestation" of God. The word is used in the same way in heathen literature to denote any supposed divine interposition in human affairs, whether accompanied by a visible appearance of the particular deity concerned, or not. See Note B.

in which HE will judge the world in righteousness *by* a man whom he hath ordained" (Acts xvii. 31), or, as it is elsewhere expressed, "the day in which HE will judge the secrets of men, *through* Jesus Christ" (Rom. ii. 16, comp. ver. 5, 6); and that "we shall all stand before the judgment seat of GOD" (Rom. xiv. 10). So the day referred to is not only called "the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. i. 8; v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14), or "the day of Christ Jesus" (Phil. i. 6), or "the day of Christ" (Phil. i. 10; ii. 16), but "the day of GOD" (2 Pet. iii. 12). Here, as throughout the economy of salvation, there is εἷς θεός, ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ εἷς κύριος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα (1 Cor. viii. 6).

It appears to me, then, that Bishop Ellicott's "palmary argument," as he calls it, derives all its apparent force from a misstatement of the question; and when we consider the express language of Christ respecting his appearing in the glory of his Father; the express statement of Paul that this ἐπιφάνεια of Christ is one which God, the Father, will *show* (1 Tim. vi. 15), and the corresponding statement of the writer to the Hebrews (i. 6, "when he again bringeth," etc.); when we consider that in the *concomitants* of the second advent, the resurrection of the dead, and the judgment of men, in which the glory of Christ will be displayed, he is everywhere represented as acting, not independently of God, the Father, but in union with him, as his agent, so that "the Father is glorified in the Son," can we find the slightest difficulty in supposing that Paul here describes the second advent as an "appearing of the *glory* of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ"?

(*b*) Bishop Ellicott's second argument is, "that the immediate context so specially relates to our Lord."—He can only refer to ver. 14, "who gave himself for us," etc. The argument rests on the assumption, that when a writer speaks of two persons, A and B, there is something strange or unnatural in adding a predicate of B alone. If it is not instantly clear that such an assumption contradicts the most familiar facts of language, one may compare the mention of God and Christ together in Gal. i. 3, 4, and 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6, and the predicate that in each case follows the mention of the latter. The passage in Galatians reads: "Grace to you and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might deliver us," etc.

(*c*) The third point is, "that the following mention of Christ's giving Himself up for us, of His abasement, does fairly account for St. Paul's ascription of a title, otherwise unusual, that specially and antithetically marks His glory."—"Otherwise *unusual*"! Does

shop Ellicott mean that "the great God" is simply an "unusual" le of Christ in the New Testament? But this is not an argument, ıt only an answer to an objection, which we shall consider by and r. It is obvious that what is said in ver. 14 can in itself afford no oof or presumption that Paul in what precedes has called Christ the great God." He uses similar language in many passages (*e. g.* ose just cited under *b* from Gal. i. 3, 4 and 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6) in ıich Christ is clearly distinguished from God.

(*d*) The fourth argument is, "that *μεγάλου* would seem uncalled r if applied to the Father." It seems to me, on the contrary, have a solemn impressiveness, suitable to the grandeur of the ent referred to. It condenses into one word what is more fully ex- essed by the accumulation of high titles applied to God in connec- on with the same subject in 1 Tim. vi. 14–16, suggesting that the ent is one in which the power and majesty of God will be conspic- ously displayed. The expression "the great God" does not occur sewhere in the New Testament, but it is not uncommon in the Old estament and later Jewish writings as a designation of Jehovah. See ote C.

(*e*) Bishop Ellicott's last argument is, that "apparently two of e Ante-Nicene (Clem. Alexand. *Protrept.* 7 [ed. Pott.] and Hip- olytus, quoted by Words.) and the great bulk of post-Nicene writers ncurred in this interpretation."—As to this, I would say that Clem- nt of Alexandria does not cite the passage in proof of the deity of rist, and there is nothing to show that he adopted the construction hich refers the *τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ* to him.* Hippolytus (*De Anti- risto* c. 67), in an *allusion* to the passage, uses the expression *τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν* of Christ, which may seem to dicate that he adopted the construction just mentioned. But it is to e observed that he omits the *τῆς δόξης*, and the *μεγάλου*, and the

* Winstanley well remarks, in his valuable essay on the use of the reek article in the New Testament, that "the observation of Whitby at Clem. Alex. quotes this text of St. Paul, when he is asserting the vinity of Christ, if it mean that he quotes it as an argument, or proof, a mistake. Clemens is all along speaking of a past appearance only, nd therefore he begins his quotation with a former verse, *ἡ χάρις τοῦ εοῦ . . .* etc., and then proceeds *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἄσμα τὸ καινόν* [I omit e quotation], etc., so that his authority inclines the other way: for he as not appealed to this text, though he had it before him, when he was xpressly asserting the divinity of Christ, as *θεός*, and *ὁ θεὸς λόγος*, but ot as *ὁ μέγας θεός*." (*Vindication of certain Passages in the Com- on English Version of the N. T.*, p. 35 f., Amer. ed., Cambridge, 819.)

The supposition of Wordsworth and Wace that Ignatius (*Eph.* c. 1) efers to this passage has, so far as I can see, no foundation.

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ after *σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, so that it is not certain that if he had quoted the passage fully, instead of merely borrowing some of its language, he would have applied all the terms to one subject. My principal reason for doubt is, that he has nowhere in his writings spoken of Christ as *ὁ μέγας θεός*, with or without *ἡμῶν*, and that it would hardly have been consistent with his theology to do this, holding so strongly as he did the doctrine of the subordination of the Son.

It is true that many writers of the fourth century and later apply the passage to Christ. At that period, and earlier, when *θεός* had become a common appellation of Christ, and especially when he was very often called "our God" or "our God and Saviour," the construction of Tit. ii. 13 which refers the *θεοῦ* to him would seem the most natural. But the *New Testament* use of language is widely different; and on that account a construction which would seem most natural in the fourth century, might not even suggest itself to a reader of the first century. That the orthodox Fathers should give to an ambiguous passage the construction which suited their theology and the use of language in their time, was almost a matter of course, and furnishes no evidence that their resolution of the ambiguity is the true one.

The cases are so numerous in which the Fathers, under the influence of a dogmatic bias, have done extreme violence to very plain language, that we can attach no weight to their preference in the case of a construction really ambiguous, like the present. For a notable example of such violence, see 2 Cor. iv. 4, *ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων*, where, through fear of Gnosticism or Manichæism, Irenæus (*Hær.* iii. 7. § 1; comp. iv. 29 (al. 48). § 2), Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* v. 11), Adamantius or Pseudo-Origen (*De recta in Deum fide*, sect. ii. Orig. *Opp.* i. 832), Chrysostom, Theodoret, Œcumenius, Theophylact, Augustine, Primasius, Sedulius Scotus, Haymo, and others make *τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* depend on *ἀπίστων* instead of *ὁ θεός*,* a construction which we should hardly hesitate to call impossible.

I have now considered all the arguments of Bishop Ellicott, citing them in full in his own language. It seems to me that no one of them has any real weight; and that a consideration of his "palmary

* For many of these writers see Whitby, *Diss. de Script. Interp. secundum Patrum Commentarios*, p. 275 f. Alford's note on this passage has a number of false references, copied without acknowledgment from Meyer, and ascribes this interpretation (after Meyer) to Origen who opposes it (*Opp.* iii. 497, ed. Delarue).

gument," which is the one mainly urged by the advocates of his onstruction of the passage, really leads to the opposite view. The me is true also, I conceive, of his reference to the expression "the eat God."

But there is a new argument which it may be worth while to notice. the English translation of the second edition of his *Biblico-Theogical Lexicon of N. T. Greek*, Cremer has added to the article θεός long note on Tit. ii. 13 which is not in the German original, and as made other alterations in the article. He here contends that τοῦ γάλου θεοῦ refers to Christ. He gives up entirely the argument om the want of the article before σωτῆρος, on which he had insisted the German edition. Nor does he urge the argument from the use ἐπιφάνεια. His only arguments are founded on the assertion that r. 14 "by its form already indicates that in ver. 13 only one subject presented"—an argument which has already been answered (see 6, under *b*), and to which, it seems to me, one cannot reasonably tach the slightest weight—and the fact that ver. 14 contains the xpression λαὸς περιούσιος, "a peculiar people," an expression used the O. T. to denote the Jewish nation as the chosen people, the eculiar possession of God. The argument rests on the assumption at because in ver. 14 the Apostle has transferred this expression to e church of Christ, "the great God" in ver. 13 must be taken as a redicate of Christ.

The case seems to me to present no difficulty, and to afford no round for such an inference. The relation of Christians to God nd Christ is such that, from its very nature, the servants of Christ e and are called the servants of God, the church of Christ the hurch of God, the kingdom of Christ the kingdom of God. So hristians are and are represented as the peculiar people and possesion of Christ, and at the same time the peculiar people and possesion of God (1 Pet. ii. 9, 10).* If Christians belong to Christ, they ust belong also to God, the Father, to whom Christ himself belongs Cor. iii. 23, "ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's"). To infer, en, that because in ver. 14 Christians are spoken of as Christ's eculiar people, the title "great God" must necessarily be understood applied to him in ver. 13, is a very extraordinary kind of reasoning.

---

* Comp. Clement of Rome, 1 *Ep. ad Cor.* c. 64 (formerly 58): "May e All-seeing God and Master of Spirits and Lord of all flesh, who hose the Lord Jesus Christ and *us through him for a peculiar people* εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον), grant," etc.

Such are the arguments which have been urged for the translation "the appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." Let us now consider what is to be said for the construction which makes τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ distinct subjects.

In the case of a grammatical ambiguity of this kind in any classical author, the first inquiry would be, What is the usage of the writer respecting the application of the title in question? Now this consideration, which certainly is a most reasonable one, seems to me here absolutely decisive. While the word θεός occurs more than five hundred times in the Epistles of Paul, not including the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is not a single instance in which it is *clearly* applied to Christ.†

In the case then of a question between two constructions, either of which is grammatically possible, should we not adopt that which accords with a usage of which we have 500 examples, without one clear exception, rather than that which is in opposition to it? The case is made still stronger by the fact that we have here not only θεοῦ but μεγάλου θεοῦ.

---

†The passages in the writings of Paul in which the title θεός has ever been supposed to be given to Christ are very few, and are all cases of very doubtful construction or doubtful reading. Alford finds it given to him only in Rom. ix. 5; but here, as is well known, many of the most eminent modern scholars make the last part of the verse a doxology to God, the Father. So, for example, Winer, Fritzsche, Meyer, De Wette, Ewald; Tischendorf, Kuenen and Cobet, Buttmann, Hahn (ed. 1861), Prof. Jowett, Prof. I. H. Godwin, Prof. Lewis Campbell of the University of St. Andrews, the Rev. Dr. B. H. Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, and Dr. Hort. Of the other passages, Eph. v. 5 and 2 Thess. i. 12 have already been considered. In 1 Tim. iii. 16 there is now a general agreement among critical scholars that ὃς ἐφανερώθη and not θεὸς ἐφανερώθη is the true reading. In Col. ii. 2, the only remaining passage, the text is uncertain; but if we adopt the reading τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ Χριστοῦ, the most probable construction is that which regards Χριστοῦ as in apposition with μυστηρίου, which is confirmed by Col. i. 27. This is the view of Bishop Ellicott, Bishop Lightfoot, Wieseler (on Gal. i. 1), and Westcott and Hort. Others, as Meyer and Huther, translate "the mystery of the God of Christ" (comp. Eph. i. 3, 17, etc.) Steiger takes Χριστοῦ as in apposition with τοῦ θεοῦ, and thus finds Christ here called God; but to justify his interpretation the Greek should rather be Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (comp. De Wette).

The habitual, and I believe *uniform*, usage of Paul corresponds with his language 1 Cor. viii. 6.

Here and elsewhere I intentionally pass by the question whether Paul's view of the nature of Christ and his relation to the Father would have allowed him to designate Christ as ὁ μέγας θεὸς καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν. This would lead to a long discussion of many passages. My argument rests on the undisputed facts respecting his habitual use of language.

Even if we do not regard the Pastoral Epistles as written by Paul, d confine our attention to them only, we reach the same result. bserve how clearly God, the Father, is distinguished from Christ in Tim. i. 1, 2; ii. 3–5; v. 21; vi. 13–16; 2 Tim. i. 2, 8, 9; iv. 1; t. i. 1, 3 (comp. for the *κατ' ἐπιταγήν* 1 Tim. i. 1, Rom. xvi. 26), iii. 4–6. Observe, particularly, that the expression "God our viour" is applied solely to the Father, who is distinguished from rist as our Saviour; God being the primal source of salvation, and rist the medium of communication, agreeably to the language of ul, 2 Cor. v. 18, *τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ*; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 6. See 1 Tim. i. ii. 3–5; iv. 10; Tit. i. 1–4; iii. 4–6; compare also Jude 25. Such ing the marked distinction between *θεός* and *Χριστός* in other ssages of these Pastoral Epistles, should we not adopt the con- uction which recognizes the same here?

An examination of the context will confirm the conclusion at ich we have arrived. I have already shown that the title "God r Saviour" in the Pastoral Epistles belongs exclusively to the ther. This is generally admitted; for example, by Bloomfield, ford, and Ellicott. Now the connection of ver. 10, in which this pression occurs, with ver. 11 is obviously such, that if *θεοῦ* denotes e Father in the former it must in the latter. Regarding it then as tled that *θεοῦ* in ver. 11 denotes the Father (and I am not aware at it has ever been disputed),* is it not harsh to suppose that e *θεοῦ* in ver. 13, in the latter part of the sentence, denotes a dif- ent subject from the *θεοῦ* in ver. 11, at the beginning of the same ntence? It appears especially harsh, when we notice the beautiful rrespondence of *ἐπιφάνειαν* in ver. 13 with the *ἐπεφάνη* of ver. 11. is correspondence can hardly have been undesigned. As the first vent of Christ was an *appearing* or visible manifestation of the *grace* God, who sent him, so his second advent will be an *appearing* of e *glory* of God, as well as of Christ.

To sum up: the reasons which are urged for giving this verbally biguous passage the construction which makes "the great God" designation of Christ, are seen, when examined, to have little no weight; on the other hand, the construction adopted in the mmon English version, and preferred by the American Revisers, is ored, if not required, by the context (comparing ver. 13 with ver.); it perfectly suits the references to the second advent in other

*If it should be questioned, all doubt will probably be removed by a mparison of the verse with Tit. iii. 3–7, and 2 Tim. i. 8, 9.

parts of the N. T.; and it is imperatively demanded by a regard t
Paul's *use of language*, unless we arbitrarily assume here a sing
exception to a usage of which we have more than 500 examples.

I might add, though I would not lay much stress on the fact, tha
the principal ancient versions, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, th
Peshitto and Harclean Syriac, the Coptic, and the Arabic, appear t
have given the passage the construction which makes God and Chri
distinct subjects. The Ethiopic seems to be the only exceptio
Perhaps, however, the construction in the Latin versions should b
regarded as somewhat ambiguous.

Among the modern scholars who have agreed with all the ol
English versions (Tyndale, Coverdale, Cranmer, the Genevan, th
Bishops' Bible, the Rhemish, and the Authorized) in preferring th
construction, are Erasmus, Calvin, Luther, Grotius, LeClerc, We
stein, Moldenhawer, Michaelis, Benson, Macknight, Abp. Newcom
Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Schott, Bretschneider, Neander (*Plantin
and Training of the Christian Church*, Robinson's revised trans., p
468, note †), De Wette (and so Möller in the 3d ed. of De Wett
1867), Meyer (on Rom. ix. 5), Fritzsche (*Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 266 ff.
Grimm, Baumgarten-Crusius (*N. T. Gr.* ed. Schott, 1839), Kreh
H. F. T. L. Ernesti (*Vom Ursprunge der Sünde*, p. 235 f.), Schuman
(*Christus*, 1852, ii. 580, note), Messner (*Die Lehre der Apostel*, 185
p. 236 f.), Huther, Ewald, Holtzmann (in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, an
with more hesitation in his *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 1880), Beyschla
(*Christol. des N. T.*, 1866, p. 212, note), Rothe (*Dogmatik*, II.
(1870), p. 110, note 3), Conybeare and Howson, Alford, Fairbairn
with some hesitation (*The Pastoral Epistles*, Edin. 1874, pp. 5
282–285), Davidson, Prof. Lewis Campbell (in the *Contemp. Re*
for Aug., 1876), Immer (*Theol. d. N. T.*, 1877, p. 393), W. F. Ges
Christi Person und Werk, Abth. II. (1878), p. 330), in opposition t
the view expressed in his earlier work, *Die Lehre von der Perso
Christi* (1856), p. 88 f., Reuss (*Les Épitres Pauliniennes*, Paris
1878, ii. 345), Farrar (*Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 536, cf. p. 61
note 1); Westcott and Hort, apparently, according to the punctua
tion of their text, as distinguished from that of their margin; and s
the grammarians Winer and T. S. Green (comp. his *Twofold N. T.*
In the case of one or two recent writers, as Pfleiderer and Weizsäcke
who have adopted the other construction, there is reason to regar
them as influenced by their view of the non-Pauline authorship
the Epistle, disposing them to find in its Christology a doctrine di
ferent from that of Paul.

Very many others, as Heydenreich, Flatt, Tholuck (*Comm. zu*

ef an die Römer, 5e Ausg., 1856, p. 482), C. F. Schmid (*Bibl. ol. des N. T.*, 2e Aufl., p. 540), Luthardt, leave the matter unde-ed. Even Bloomfield, in the Addenda to his last work (*Critical notations, Additional and Supplementary, on the N. T.*, Lond. 1860, 352), after retracting the version given in his 9th edition of the ek Testament, candidly says: "I am ready to admit that the de of interpreting maintained by Huther and Al[ford] completely sfies all the grammatical requirements of the sentence; that it is n structurally and contextually quite as probable as the other, and haps more agreeable to the Apostle's way of writing."

The view of Lange (*Christliche Dogmatik*, Heidelb. 1851, ii. 161 Van Hengel (*Interp. Ep. Pauli ad Romanos*, ii. 358, note), and enkel (*Das Christusbild der Apostel*, 1879, p. 357), that Ἰησοῦ στοῦ is here in apposition to τῆς δόξης, the words which precede ὁ μεγ. θεοῦ καὶ σωτ. ἡμῶν) being referred to the Father, has so e to commend it that it may be passed over without discussion.

NOTE A.—(See p. 4.)

On the Omission of the Article before σωτῆρος ἡμῶν.

Middleton's rule is as follows:—"When two or more attributives ed by a copulative or copulatives are assumed of [assumed to belong the same person or thing, before the first attributive the article is rted; before the remaining ones it is omitted." (*Doctrine of the ek Article*, Chap. III. Sect. IV. § 2, p. 44, Amer. edition.) If the cle is not inserted before the second of the two assumable attribut-thus connected, he maintains that both must be understood as ribing the same subject.

y attributives he understands adjectives, participles, and nouns ch are "significant of *character*, *relation*, or *dignity*."

e admits that the rule is not always applicable to *plurals* (p. 49); again, where the attributives "are in their nature plainly incompat-" "We cannot wonder," he says, "if in such instances the principle he rule has been sacrificed to negligence, or even to studied brevity. The second article should in strictness be expressed; but in such s the writers knew that it might be safely understood." (pp. 51, 52.) he *principle* which covers all the cases coming under Middleton's , so far as that rule bears on the present question, is, I believe, sim-this: The definite article is inserted before the second attributive n it is *felt to be needed to distinguish different subjects*; but when

the two terms connected by a copulative are *shown by any circumstance* to denote distinct subjects, then the article may be omitted, for the excellent reason that it is not needed.*

Middleton's rule, with its exceptions, applies to the English language as well as to the Greek. Webster (Wm.) remarks in his *Syntax and Synonyms of the Greek Testament*:—

"In English, the Secretary and Treasurer means one person; the Secretary and the Treasurer mean two persons. In speaking of horses, the black and white means the piebald, but the black and the white mean two different horses." (pp. 35, 36.)

But this rule is very often broken when such formal precision of expression is not felt to be necessary. If I should say, "I saw the President and Treasurer of the Boston and Albany Railroad yesterday," no one, probably, would doubt that I spoke of two different persons, or (unless perhaps Mr. G. Washington Moon) would imagine that I was violating the laws of the English language. The fact that the two offices referred to are generally or always in such corporations held by different persons would prevent any doubt as to the meaning. Again, the remark that "Mr. A. drove out to-day with his black and white horses" would be perfectly correct English and perfectly unambiguous if addressed to one who *knew* that Mr. A. had only four horses, two of them black and the other two white.

Take an example from the New Testament. In Matt. xxi. 12 we read that Jesus "cast out all those that were selling and buying in the temple," *τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας*. No one can reasonably suppose that the same persons are here described as both selling and buying. In Mark the two classes are made distinct by the insertion of *τοὺς* before *ἀγοράζοντας*; here it is safely left to the intelligence of the reader to distinguish them.

In the case before us, the omission of the article before *σωτῆρος* seems to me to present no difficulty; not because *σωτῆρος* is made sufficiently definite by the addition of *ἡμῶν* (Winer), for, since God as well as Christ is often called "our Saviour," *ἡ δόξα τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, *standing alone*, would most naturally be understood of one subject, namely, God, the Father; but the addition of *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* to *σωτῆρος ἡμῶν* changes the case entirely, restricting the *σωτῆρος ἡμῶν* to a person or being who, according to Paul's *habitual use of language*, is distinguished from the person or being whom he designates as *ὁ θεός*, so that there was no need of the repetition of the article to prevent ambiguity. So in 2 Thess. i. 12, the expression *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου* would naturally be understood of one subject, and the article would be

*See the remarks (by Andrews Norton) in the Appendix to the American edition of Winstanley's *Vindication of Certain Passages in the Common Eng. Version of the N. T.*, p. 45 ff.; or Norton's *Statement of Reasons*, &c., 2d ed., (1856), pp. 199–202.

quired before *κυρίου* if two were intended; but the simple addition of *ησοῦ Χριστοῦ* to *κυρίου* makes the reference to the two distinct subjects ear without the insertion of the article.

But the omission of the article before the second of two subjects con- ected by *καί* is not without effect. Its absence naturally leads us to nceive of them as united in some common relation, while the repetition the article would present them to the mind as distinct objects of ought. The difference between the two cases is like the difference tween the expressions "the kingdom of Christ and God," and "the ngdom of Christ and of God" in English. The former expression ould denote one kingdom, belonging in some sense to both; the latter ould permit the supposition that two distinct kingdoms were referred , though it would not require this interpretation. The repetition of e preposition, however, as of the article, brings the subjects separately fore the mind. In the present case, the omission of the article before *τῆρος*, conjoining the word closely with *θεοῦ*, may indicate that the ory spoken of belongs in one aspect to God and in another to Christ mp. Eph. v. 5); or that the glory of God and the glory of Christ are splayed in conjunction (comp. 2 Thess. i. 12, *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰ. Χ.*; Luke ix. 26).

There may be still another reason for the omission of the article here fore *σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, or, perhaps I should say, another effect of its sence. It is a recognized principle that the omission of the article fore an appellative which designates a person tends to fix the attention the quality or character or peculiar relation expressed by the appel- tive, while the insertion of the article tends to throw into the shade the herent meaning of the term, and to give it the force of a simple proper me. For example, in Heb. i. 2 *ἐν τῷ υἱῷ* would simply mean "in *r* by) the Son," or "his Son;" but the omission of the article (*ἐν υἱῷ*) mphasizes the significance of the term *υἱός*,—"by one who is a *Son*," d in virtue of what that designation expresses is far above all "the ophets." (Comp. T. S. Green, *Gram. of the N. T.*, 2d ed., pp. 47 f., f.) So here the meaning may be, "the appearing of the glory of the eat God and a *Saviour* of us," one who is our *Saviour*, "Jesus rist"—essentially equivalent to "of the great God and Jesus Christ *as* ir Saviour;" (comp. Acts xiii. 23); the idea suggested being that the lvation or deliverance of Christians will be consummated at the second lvent, when Christ "shall appear, to them that wait for him, unto *sal- ation*." Comp. Phil. iii. 20, 21, "For our citizenship is in heaven, from hence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, *ἐξ οὗ καὶ τῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*, who shall change the body our humiliation," &c.; Rom. viii. 23, 24; xiii. 11; 1 Thess. v. 8, 9; eb. ix. 28; 1 Pet. i. 5. The position of *σωτῆρος ἡμῶν before Ἰησοῦ ριστοῦ*, as well as the absence of the article, favors this view; comp. cts xiii. 23; Phil. iii. 20, and contrast Tit. i. 4.

The points which I would make, then, are, that the insertion of the article before σωτῆρος was not needed here to show that the word designates a subject distinct from τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ; and that its absence serves to bring out the thoughts that, in the event referred to, the glory of God and that of Christ are displayed *together*, and that Christ then appears as *Saviour*, in the sense that the salvation of Christians, including what St. Paul calls "the redemption of the body," is then made complete. These are conceptions which accord with the view which the Apostle has elsewhere presented of the second advent.

But as many English writers still assume that the construction of Tit. ii. 13 and similar passages has been settled by Bishop Middleton, I will quote in conclusion a few sentences, by way of caution, from one of the highest authorities on the grammar of the Greek Testament, Alexander Buttmann. He says:—

"It will probably never be possible, either in reference to profane literature or to the N. T., to bring down to rigid rules which have no exception, the inquiry when with several substantives connected by conjunctions the article is repeated, and when it is not. . . . From this fact alone it follows, that in view of the subjective and arbitrary treatment of the article on the part of individual writers (cf. § 124, 2) it is very hazardous in particular cases to draw important inferences affecting the sense or even of a doctrinal nature, from the single circumstance of the use or omission of the article; see e. g. Tit. ii. 13; Jude 4; 2 Pet. i. 1 and the expositors of these passages." (*Gram. of the N. T. Greek*, § 125, 14; p. 97, Thayer's trans.)

NOTE B. (See p. 5.)

The use of ἐπιφάνεια and kindred terms with reference to God.

It has already been observed that the expression used in Tit. ii. 13 is not ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ, but ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ, and that the reference of the title "the great God" to the Father accords perfectly with the representation elsewhere in the N. T., that *the glory* of God, the Father, as well as of Christ, will be displayed at the second advent. This reference, therefore, presents no difficulty. But the weakness of the argument against it may be still further illustrated by the use of the term ἐπιφάνεια and kindred expressions in Josephus and other Jewish writings. It will be seen that any extraordinary manifestation of divine power, whether exerted directly, or through an intermediate agent, is spoken of as an ἐπιφάνεια of God.

1. For example, the parting of the waters of the Red Sea is described as "the appearing" or "manifestation of God." Μωϋσῆς δὲ ὁρῶν τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ θεροῦ κ. τ. λ. Joseph. *Ant.* ii. 16. § 2.

2. Speaking of the journey through the wilderness, Josephus says: The cloud was present, and standing over the tabernacle, signified *the ppearing of God*," τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ θεοῦ. (*Ant.* iii. 14. § 4.)

3. Josephus uses both ἡ παρουσία τοῦ θεοῦ, and ἡ ἐπιφάνεια [τοῦ εοῦ], in reference to a miraculous shower of rain; *Ant.* xviii. 8 (al. 10).

6. So a violent thunderstorm which deterred the army of Xerxes from tacking Delphi is described by Diodorus Siculus as ἡ τῶν θεῶν ἐπιφά-ια (*Bibl. Hist.* xi. 14). Comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 11 (al. 14). § 7, where ἐμφάνεια τοῦ θεοῦ is used in a similar way. Observe also how in erod's speech (*Ant.* xv. 5 (al. 6). § 3) angels are spoken of as bring-g God εἰς ἐμφάνειαν to men.

4. In reference to the miraculous guidance of Abraham's servant hen sent to procure Rebecca as a wife for Isaac, the marriage is said have been brought about ὑπὸ θείας ἐπιφανείας, where we might say, by a divine interposition." (Joseph. *Ant.* i. 16. § 3.)

5. After giving an account of the deliverance of Elisha from the oops sent by Ben-Hadad to arrest him, which were struck with blind-ess, Josephus says that the king "marvelled at the strange event, and e *appearing* (or *manifestation*) and power of the God of the Israelites τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ δύναμιν), and at the prophet ith whom the Deity was so evidently present for help." (*Ant.* ix. 4. 4.) Elijah had prayed that God would "*manifest* (ἐμφανίσαι) his power nd *presence*," παρουσίαν. (*Ibid.* § 3.)

6. In Josephus, *Ant.* v. 8. §§ 2, 3, the appearance of *an angel sent by od* is described as "a sight of God," ἐκ τῆς ὄψεως τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν ὸν αὐτοῖς ὁραθῆναι.

7. In 2 Macc. iii. 24, in reference to the horse with the terrible rider, nd the angels that scourged Heliodorus, we read, ὁ τῶν πατέρων [al. εημάτων] κύριος καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης ἐπιφάνειαν μεγάλην οιήσεν, and in ver. 30, τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπιφανέντος κυρίου, "the lmighty Lord *having appeared*," and farther on, ver. 34, Heliodorus is oken of as having been "scourged *by him*," ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, *i. e.* the Lord, ccording to the common text, retained by Grimm and Keil. But here r ὑπ᾽ ὠὐτοῦ Fritzsche reads ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, which looks like a gloss (comp. 21, τὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενομένας ἐπιφανείας).

8. The sending of a good angel is described as an ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ θεοῦ, Macc. xv. 27, comp. ver. 22, 23. Observe also that in 2 Macc. xv. 34 nd 3 Macc. v. 35 τὸν ἐπιφανῆ κύριον or θεόν does not mean "the *lorious* Lord (*or* God)" as it has often been misunderstood, but ἐπιφανής esignates God as one who *manifests* his power in the deliverance of s people, a present help in time of need, "the interposing God" Bissell). Compare the note of Valesius (Valois) on Eusebius, *Hist. ccl.* ii. 6. § 2.

9. See also 2 Macc. xii. 22, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πάντα ἐφορῶντος ἐπιφανείας γενομένου ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς; comp. 2 Macc. xi. 8, 10, 13.

10. "They made application to him who . . . always helpeth his portion [his people] μετ' ἐπιφανείας," 2 Macc. xiv. 15.

11. In 3 Macc. v. 8, we are told that the Jews "besought the Almighty Lord to rescue them from imminent death μετὰ μεγαλομεροῦς ἐπιφανείας," and again, ver. 51, "to take pity on them μετὰ ἐπιφανείας." The answer to the prayer is represented as made by the intervention of angels, vi. 18. In ch. i. 9, God is spoken of as having glorified Jerusalem ἐν ἐπιφανείᾳ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ.

12. In the Additions to Esther, Text B, vii. 6 (Fritzsche, *Libr. Apoc. V. T.* p. 71), the sun and light in Mordecai's dream are said to represent the ἐπιφανία τοῦ θεοῦ, "appearing" (*or* manifestation) "of God" in the deliverance of the Jews.

13. In the so-called Second Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, c. 12, § 1, we read: "Let us therefore wait hourly [*or* betimes *Lightf.*] for the kingdom of God in love and righteousness, because we know not the day *of the appearing of God*, τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ θεοῦ." The τοῦ θεοῦ, employed thus absolutely, must, I think, refer to the Father, according to the writer's use of language. This consideration does not seem to me invalidated by c. 1, § 1, or by the use of ἐπιφάνεια in reference to Christ, c. 17; but others may think differently.

THE USE of the term ἐπιφάνεια in the later Greek classical writers corresponds with its use as illustrated above. Casaubon has a learned note on the word in his *Exercit. ad Annales Eccles. Baronianas* II. xi. Ann. I. Num. 36 (p. 185, Lond. 1614), in which he says: "Graeci scriptores ἐπιφάνειαν appellant apparitionem numinis *quoquo tandem modo deus aliquis suae praesentiae signum dedisse crederetur.*" (Comp. his note on Athenæus, xii. 11. al. 60.) Wesseling in his note on Diodorus Siculus i. 25 repeats this, and adds other illustrations from Diodorus, viz. iii. 62; iv. 82 [v. 62?]; xi. 14; and xiv. 69 (a striking example). See also the story of the Vestal virgin in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* ii. 68 (cf. 69), and of Servius Tullius, *ibid.* iv. 2. Other examples are given by Elsner, *Obss. Sacr.* on 2 Pet. i. 16, and by the writers to whom he refers. But it is not worth while to pursue this part of the subject further here. One who wishes to do so will find much interesting matter in the notes of the very learned Ezechiel Spanheim on Callimachus, *Hymn. in Apoll.* 13, and *in Pallad.* 101, and in his *Dissertationes de Præstantia et Usu Numismatum antiquorum*, ed. nova, vol. i. (Lond. 1706), Diss. vii. p. 425 sqq.

I WILL only add in conclusion: If Paul could speak of the first advent of Christ as an ἐπιφάνεια of the *grace* of God (see ἐπεφάνη Tit. ii. 11; iii. 4), can we, in view of all that has been said, regard it as in the least degree strange or unnatural that he should speak of his second advent as an ἐπιφάνεια of the *glory* of God?

NOTE C. (See p. 7.)

On the expression, τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ.

There is no other passage in the N. T. in which this expression occurs, the reading of the "received text" in Rev. xix. 17 having very slender support. But the epithet "great" is so often applied to God in the Old Testament and later Jewish writings, and is so appropriate in connection with the display of the divine power and glory in the event referred to, that it is very wonderful that the use of the word here should be regarded as an argument for the reference of the *θεός* to Christ on the ground that "God the Father did not *need* the exalting and laudatory epithet *μέγας*," as Usteri says (*Paulin. Lehrbegriff*, 5 te Aufl., p. 26. It might be enough to answer, with Fritzsche, "At ego putaveram, Deum quum *sit magnus*, jure etiam *magnum appellari*" (*Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 268). But the following references will show how naturally Paul might apply this designation to the Father: Deut. viii. 21 (Sept. and Heb.); x. 17. 2 Chr. ii. 5 (4). Neh. i. 5; vii. 6; ix. 32. Ps. lxxvii. 13; xxxvi. 10. Jer. xxxii. 18,19. Dan. ii. 45; ix. 4. Psalt. Sal. ii. 33. 3 Macc. vii. 2. Comp. *ὁ μέγιστος θεός*, 3 Macc. i. 16; iii. 11; v. 25; vii. 2; "the great Lord," Ecclus. xxxix. 6; xlvi. 5. 2 Macc. v. 20; xii. 15. So very often in the Sibylline Oracles; I have noted 31 examples in the Third Book alone, the principal part of which was the production of a Jewish writer in the second century before Christ.

Though all will agree that God, the Father, does not "need" exalting epithets, such epithets are applied to him freely by the Apostle Paul and other writers of the N. T. For example, he is called by Paul "the incorruptible God," "the living God," "the eternal God," "the only wise God," "the only God," "the invisible God," "the living and true God," "the blessed God;" and since there is no other place in which the apostle has unequivocally designated Christ as *θεός*, much less *θεός* with a high epithet, it certainly seems most natural to suppose that *ὁ μέγας θεός* here designates the Father. Professor Wace (in the "Speaker's Commentary") appeals to 1 John v. 20, where he assumes that Christ is designated as "the true God." But he must be aware that this depends on the reference of the pronoun *οὗτος*, and that many of the best expositors refer this to the leading subject of the preceding sentence, namely, *τὸν ἀληθινόν*; so e. g. Erasmus, Grotius, Wetstein, Michaelis, Lücke, DeWette, Meyer, Neander, Huther, Düsterdieck, Gerlach, Brückner, Ewald, Holtzmann, Braune, Haupt, Rothe, C. F. Schmid, Reuss, Alford, and Sinclair (in Ellicott's *N. T. Comm.*); and so the grammarians Alt, Winer, Wilke, Buttmann, and Schirlitz; comp. also John xvii. 3. So doubtful a passage, and that not in the writings of Paul but John, can hardly serve to render it probable that Paul has here applied the designation *ὁ μέγας θεός* to Christ rather than to God, the Father.

Note on I. Cor. vii. 15.

BY PROF. E. P. GOULD.

In regard to the question whether the permission to separate, in this verse, leaves the believer who has been deserted by the husband or wife free to marry again: Meyer says, yes; because Paul's permission in this case is based on the fact, necessary to his interpretation of the Lord's command, that that command applies only to cases in which both parties are believers, *i. e.*, that it is a Christian, not a general law. DeWette makes the same answer, though on the entirely different ground that the case contemplated here, like the one treated as an exception to his prohibition of divorce by our Lord, is one in which the marriage tie is actually broken. But, as regards Meyer's position, it seems scarcely tenable that our Lord's command is to be treated as merely Christian, and not general law. For his argument in Mt. 19 is based on the original relations of man and woman, established at creation and inherent in their structure, and must therefore be universal in its application, not limited to Christians. It is true that in Mt. 5, Christ is laying down the law of his kingdom, but that law is based on universal human relations and obligations, and is applicable in all its parts to man as such. And in Mt. 19. Christ is discussing what is lawful under the Jewish dispensation, but on the same general grounds. As to De Wette's position, that both in our Lord's treatment of the matter and in Paul's, the exception to the law is reducible to an actual dissolution of the marriage tie, which leaves the party divorced free, our Lord, instead of leaving it so that the two cases can be classed together in this way, himself draws the line between them, and declares that, where there is divorce without adultery, he who marries the divorced party commits adultery. Our Lord does not consider divorce an actual, but only a formal dissolution of the marriage tie.

On the whole, then, it seems that we can go just as far as the postle does in his exception to the statement of our Lord, and no rther. Because there is the line which separates between obedience d infraction of that law. The law is that marriage is a physical nnection based on the physical relation of the sexes, and can be ssolved properly only physically and really, not formally. And ence to contract another marriage when there had been no such real ssolution, is, as our Lord says, to commit adultery, which is cer-inly applicable to this case. But what the apostle actually permits volves no infraction of the law on the part of the believer to whom he speaking. For when he advises the Christian to allow the unbeliever depart in order to avoid strife, it simply means that he is to accept e situation forced on him, he himself being passive in the matter. nd it is important to notice that the apostle says not a word against e obligation of the unbelieving husband or wife to keep up the nnection, but simply permits him to have his way, as something eyond the apostle's control. But if we may judge from what he mmands in the case over which he as a Christian apostle does have ntrol, we should say that he does not consider the action permitted be morally right.

On Romans ix. 5.

BY PROF. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, D. D.

The English Version of 1611, as is well known, rendered this verse, "*Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ* came, *who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.*" As thus rendered, the verse has been regarded as asserting in the plainest terms the Divinity of our Lord, and has been used by theologians with much confidence and much emphasis in controversies with opponents. The Revised Version of 1881 gives a similar translation in its text: "*Whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.*" This Version, however, adds a marginal note in the following words: "Some modern interpreters place a full stop after *flesh*, and translate, *He who is God over all be (is) blessed forever;* or *He who is over all is God, blessed forever.* Others punctuate, *flesh, who is over all. God be (is) blessed forever.*" For this note, which is the suggestion of the Revision Company in England, the American Revisers propose to substitute, in accordance with the common form of expression adopted in such cases, the word *Or*, and to read, "Or, *flesh: he who is over all, God, be blessed forever.*" The New Version, thus, recognises the possibility of a different rendering from that which it still retains from the old one, or, at least, acknowledges that a portion of the scholars of recent times have believed such a rendering to be correct. The ordinary reader of the English New Testament is now, accordingly, put in possession of what his fathers did not, in general, know—the fact that to some scholarly minds the words do not appear to declare the Divinity of Christ, or to assert that he is God over all blessed for ever.

The renewed examination of a passage of so much importance could scarcely be regarded as unsuitable at any time. Certainly it cannot be so at present, when the attention of all readers is called to the words by the added notes of the Revisers in both nations. The

uestions may well be asked, Whether the rendering of the Old Ver-
on ought to be retained in the new work ; whether, if retained, it
ught to be accompanied by a marginal note giving another explana-
on ; and in what form this note, if added, ought to be expressed.
he most important , as well as the most interesting of these ques-
ons, however, is the one first mentioned. Is the true translation of
ie words of the Apostle that which we find in the text of the Re-
sed Version, or does some construction of the clause presented in
ie margin deserve to be considered as the one originally intended?
We should approach the consideration of this question, as it seems
us, first as verbal and grammatical interpreters alone,—asking, apart
om all regard to St. Paul's doctrinal teaching, what the words before
s most naturally mean, in the connection in which they stand; and
nly afterwards should we take our view of them as looking from the
eneral doctrine of the Apostle. This is the natural order of exam-
ation in all cases. The words of a particular passage have a right
be interpreted by the common rules of language, and to have their
eaning determined in independence of anything beyond the limits
their own context. A writer may not have intended to bring out,
a particular place, what he states as the substance of his teaching
sewhere. He may even have a different view of truth at one time
om that which he has at another. We owe it to him to take and
xplain the sentence which he gives us to read, precisely as he gives
This order, also, is the safest one. By following it, we are least
xposed to those doctrinal pre-judgments which are so apt to make
all partial and one-sided in our dealing with the words of Scrip-
re. But, while we look at the passage offered for examination at
st in this way, we fail in duty, when we undertake to interpret
writer like St. Paul, unless, before our final decision, we inquire
hether the meaning assigned by us to what he says is out of har-
ony with the Christian doctrine which he teaches.

Proceeding after this manner, let us consider the verse under dis-
ussion in view of its words or phrases, and their natural connection
id construction. To which of the renderings are we led as the
ore probable one, or the only allowable one, when we pursue our
quiries in this way? For convenience in our comparison, we select
e American marginal translation as the one to put in contrast with
at of the text, reserving what may be said upon the other sugges-
ons, in the English note, to a later point. We propose, also, to
ace the considerations favoring the translation in the text of the Re-
sed Version first in order, and to follow them with some suggestions
specting those upon the opposite side of the question.

I. It can hardly be denied, we think, that ὁ ὤν is more naturally connected with ὁ Χριστός κ. τ. λ. as a descriptive clause, than with the following words as the beginning of a new and independent sentence. This construction of ὁ ὤν, in cases similar to that which is here presented, is the almost universal one both in the New Testament and in other Greek. In 2 Cor. xi. 31, for example, where the words ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας occur, as they do here, no one would hesitate to refer them to ὁ θεός which precedes, even if they stood at the end of the verse, or if the construction of the verse were so changed as to read ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οἶδεν ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. They would be thus referred, because the mind naturally carries back the participial clause to πατήρ as if a descriptive relative sentence. That ὁ ὤν followed by other words must always have this relative character, and cannot begin an independent sentence as its subject, it is, of course, idle to assert. Too many instances in which the phrase is used in the latter way may be cited at once, to allow any such position to be taken. Cf. *e. g.* Matt. xii. 30, Jno. iii. 31, viii. 47. But the peculiarity of Rom. ix. 5, as compared with such passages, lies in the fact, that in the clause immediately preceding there is a prominent noun to which the phrase is most easily joined, and a noun, also, designating a person of whom a description in the way of praise might be readily expected. Under such circumstances the reader, as we cannot doubt, would find himself impelled to refer ὁ ὤν to this noun and this person. The writer would be aware, when he wrote, that this would be the impulse of every one whose eye should chance to fall upon his words. If, therefore, he did not design this reference to be made, he would, we must believe, have been careful to avoid the danger—we may almost say the certainty—of it, by adopting another construction for his sentence, which would be exposed to no such misapprehension. Especially would this have been the case, where a misunderstanding would be attended with a wrong conception of a most important truth. While we admit, then, the possibility that ὁ ὤν opens an entirely new sentence, we think it cannot be denied that the *presumption* lies in favor of the view which connects this phrase with χριστός, and that the *burden of proof* is on the side of those who would reject this view.

This presumption and the consequent burden of proof are those which we find, at this point, upon the grammatical side of the question, and apart from the Apostle's doctrinal teaching. The fact of their existence is worthy of serious consideration, as we attempt to decide upon the meaning of the verse. Undoubtedly, however, too much stress may be laid upon this fact. Not only so, but it must be

mitted that more weight has been given to it by some writers than due estimate of its importance would justify. There is, at the ost, only a presumption in favor of this construction of the clause as ainst the other; and a presumption may be overbalanced by proba- ities not yet considered. The grammatical argument may, per- ps, be compelled to give way before the force of what we discover the doctrinal side. If, for example, it can be shown that St. Paul s distinctly, and perhaps frequently, declared that Christ is not od, we must cease to press this presumption. Dr. Liddon, in his Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ," page 4, note, says, "We may be very certain that if ἐπὶ πάντων θεός uld prove to be an unwarranted reading, no scholar, however So- inianizing his bias, would hesitate to say that ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς κ. τ. λ. ould be referred to the proper name which precedes it." But Dr. ddon and all other competent scholars must be aware that the ords which he supposes to be omitted, and on the omission of which e statement made by him is founded, are very vital words in the ntence. They are, it may be, the words which determine the true nstruction; so that, while no scholar would hesitate to connect ὢν with χριστός in case they were not present, every scholar ought ot only to hesitate, but also to refuse to make this connection when ey are present. The Apostle's doctrine as to the relation between ιστός and θεός, as we determine it from other passages of his writings, ay prove to be such that ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός cannot, by any pro- bility whatever, be regarded as descriptive of χριστός. We say, *may* —for we are assuming that, as yet, we have not ascertained what e Apostle's doctrine on the subject is. The grammatical presump- on, to which we have referred, is not so strong as to be practically cisive of the question. This we frankly admit, and, in our judg- ent, it must be admitted. But such a presumption nevertheless ists, and it deserves notice as showing the probability as to the true nstruction of the words. We must, therefore, take our position at is point, at the outset of the discussion, and must allow, as we rsue this first part of the argument, that ὁ ὤν, grammatically con- dered, is more easily and naturally construed in connection with ιστός, than as the subject of a new and doxological clause.

II. We turn now to consider, next in order, the phrase τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. This phrase, by reason of the very limitation which it contains, ggests something of the nature of a contrast. If Christ did not ve some other relation, or stand in some other position besides this e connected with the Jews, and different from it, there would be no

08203

occasion for any such words. If He were in every sense and respec "from the Jews," the Apostle would, beyond any reasonable doubt have said merely ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός. There is no instance in the New Testament where κατὰ σάρκα is used, in which such a contrast is no plainly intended. There will, however, as we suppose, be little con troversy on this point. The main question as related to this phrase in the present verse is, not whether a contrast is intended, but whether it is expressed. In regard to this question, extreme positions have been taken by different writers in opposition to each other, and with equal confidence on both sides. The two parties have agreed only in one particular. They have both asserted that the answer is determined *decisively* by the mere presence of the phrase itself.

On the one hand, it is maintained that the expression τὸ κατὰ σάρκα requires as an antithesis a reference to Christ's divine nature (so *e. g.* Lange), and thus ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ., which are the only words in the passage that can set forth the antithesis, must necessarily contain it. We cannot believe that this assertion, as declaring such a necessity, can be established. There are several examples of the use of κατὰ σάρκα without any added expression of this character, in the Pauline Epistles. One of these is in the immediate context of this verse, namely, in Rom. ix. 3, where the Apostle speaks of the Israelites as his *kinsmen according to the flesh*, and yet says nothing of them in any other and contrasted relation. As for τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, no instance of its use outside of the verse before us occurs either in the writings of St. Paul, or in any of the other New Testament books.* But there are such instances in other Greek writings, where it is plain that there is no expressed antithesis. A very noticeable one—noticeable by reason of the striking similarity of the language to that which the Apostle here employs—is found in the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, chap. xxxii. In speaking of Jacob, Clement says ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. Whatever contrast may be implied here, none is set forth in words by the author. These examples of the use of κατὰ σάρκα, either with or without the neuter article, are sufficient to show that there is no necessity appertaining to the laws of the Greek language, and none arising from any inevitable obscurity of thought as involved in such a phrase without it, for a distinct expression of the intended antithesis. Some writers, however, who are not disposed to go so far as to assert that the phrase *must*, when referring to Christ, have the contrast *always* supplied in words, affirm that it cannot be otherwise *here*. Thus Philippi says, "The suppression of the anti-

* The textual reading in Acts ii. 30, which includes these words, should doubtless be rejected.

nesis, and its supply in thought merely, cannot take place where, as ere, the thesis occurs only for the sake of the antithesis. "*τὸ κατὰ άρκα*," he adds, "stands merely for the sake of the following *ὁ ὢν τὶ πάντων θεός*. Without this contrast the words would imply a iminution of the prerogative of Israel. The Apostle would then ave written simply *καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός*; for that the Messiah springs om the Jews is a higher privilege than that He springs from them fter the flesh merely. But that *He* springs from them after the flesh ho is God over all, this is the highest conceivable prerogative." If e were considering probabilities only, this reasoning would have uch force. But it must be borne in mind that the words of Philippi nclude a *cannot*, and claim a *necessity* as existing. That *τὸ κατὰ άρκα* is inserted because Christ had another relation, in which he did ot belong to the Jewish race, may be admitted. This admission, owever, is far from being the same thing as to say, that this relation ust be set forth in the words *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*. How do we now that the Apostle did not add the limiting phrase simply because e and his readers appreciated the fact, that the Messiah was not om the Jews in every sense? How do we know that he intended o define particularly what he was in other respects? How do we etermine—not that he may, or probably does—but that he *must* ive to his sentence this especial emphasis of which Philippi speaks, r that he intends to assign to the Jews "the highest conceivable rerogative?" Those who affirm that the phrase itself renders it abso-ıtely certain that the words *ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ.* are antithetical to it, are ssuming a ground which, as we think, cannot be successfully de-ended.

In direct opposition to the writers of the class just alluded to, the earned Dutch scholar, van Hengel, in an extended note in his Commen-ary on this Epistle, endeavors to prove that, according to Greek usage *ὁ κατὰ σάρκα* here requires a period to be placed after it, and thus ne following words must begin a new sentence. His position is that *ὁ κατὰ σάρκα* must be distinguished from *κατὰ σάρκα*, and that, when ne neuter article is thus used with a restrictive phrase, the appropriate irect contrast is suggested by and involved in this phrase, and any ırther antithesis is excluded. This position seems to us indefensible, it amounts to a declaration that a writer, after using *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, annot state in words what the person to whom he is referring is *τὸ ατὰ πνεῦμα*. Do not the passages cited by Meyer, in his notes on his verse,—namely, Xenophon's Cyr. v. 4, 11, (*νῦν τὸ μὲν ἐπ' ἐμοὶ ἴχομαι, τὸ δ' ἐπί σοι σέσωσμαι*), Plato, Minos, 320 C., (*νομωφύ-ακι γὰρ ὡτῷ ἐχρῆτο ὁ Μίνως κατὰ τὸ ἄστυ, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην*

Κρήτην τῷ Τάλῳ), sufficiently prove the opposite? It also seems indefensible, if it involves the assertion that, though the Apostle might have expressed the contrast here by a phrase including *τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα*, he could not have set it forth without these words, provided that he desired to use other phraseology giving in substance the same idea. Language is not bound in cast-iron chains. Certainly the language of St. Paul is not. But it is not necessary to enter upon a prolonged discussion respecting this point. If we admit everything which this distinguished commentator can possibly intend to maintain, the question is not settled, as he supposes it to be. There may not be here any such distinct (*τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα*) contrast as van Hengel is excluding. The Apostle may be—not to say, is—stating not what Christ is on the *σάρξ* and on the *πνεῦμα* side, *i. e.* giving a description of Him in his two natures or relations, but simply that Christ, who is God over all, came from the Jews *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*. Could he not have said, Christ, who is the Son of God, or who is the Saviour of the world, came from the Jews *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*? If he had desired to lay an especial emphasis on the clause beginning with *who is* in this latter sentence, could he not have placed it after *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, instead of before these words? If he could, he could do the same thing in the case before us. This, as we believe, is precisely what he intended to do. But even the possibility that this view of his purpose is correct proves that no such argument as that of this Dutch writer is conclusive.*

We are thrown back, therefore—on both sides—upon probabilities, and must pursue our examination accordingly. In order to determine what these probabilities are, however, we must observe what the author is attempting to do in the verses to which this passage belongs. It is evident that his object is to set forth the privileges and honors of the Israelitish people, in which he as a Jew might naturally

*If the reading of the Textus Receptus in Acts ii. 30 were adopted—*εἰδὼς ὅτι ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν χριστὸν, καθίσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ*—could not the words *τὸν ὄντα ἐπὶ πάντων θεόν* have been added to *χριστόν* by the author? Would he, because of the presence of *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* have been compelled by the inviolable laws of the Greek language to omit these words, however greatly he desired to insert them in his sentence? We cannot believe that the language is fettered so closely as this. But if it is thus limited, so far as the setting forth of a direct contrast is concerned, it will not follow that there is a similar limitation with reference to such a phrase as the one before us, when introduced for the purpose indicated above.

ory, as an evidence that, in anything which he was about to say specting them, he was moved by no feeling of hostility. These nors and privileges he brings before the reader in a series of terms, nich are clearly arranged in an order of climax. At the end of the ries is mentioned, as the greatest and highest distinction of his tion, the fact that Christ belonged to them in a certain sense or on certain side,—*τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*. So far there can be no difference of inion. The Apostle's position is plain. But if this be so, is it t antecedently probable, that—in case he could point out, on the *εὖρμα* side, some peculiar glory appertaining to Christ, which would rve to show in the most emphatic way what the honor to the Jews having him appear as one of themselves was—he would for the ry purpose of his climax, suggest it to the reader's mind? We can-t doubt that an affirmative answer to this question must be given. however, the *ὁ ὤν* clause is referred to Christ, as descriptive of im, it contains just such a statement of His exalted position as ould, in the highest degree, serve this purpose. It presents the nor divinely bestowed upon the people as nothing else could do; ch honor as might well lead the Apostle to the extraordinary ex-ession of devotion to them which we find two verses earlier. On e other hand, the insertion of an independent sentence ascribing aise to God the Father here, whatever may be said as to the pos-le fitness of such a sentence in this context, deprives the passage this emphasis of climax, if we may so speak, which the author ap-ars to be aiming at as one of his main objects.

We are considering the words, it must be remembered, in connec-n with the rules of language and grammar, at present. Looking the sentence in this way, we may say, (*a.*) *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* naturally d necessarily suggests the idea of contrast; (*b.*) this contrast, though, deed, it may not always be expressed, will probably be expressed nenever the thought can be brought out more clearly or more im-essively by this means; (*c.*) in the present case, it is evident that e greatest force is given to the words, if the antithesis is distinctly ated; (*d.*) therefore, in this case, the phrase *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* throws e presumption in favor of the view which holds that we have a state-ent of the antithesis within the sentence; (*e.*) inasmuch as the ause *ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ.* may be interpreted in such a way as to answer the rpose of an antithesis (even expressing it in the manner best apted to the carrying out of a design which the writer manifestly s in mind), and inasmuch as there is nothing else in the verses nich can answer this purpose, the probability is that this clause es express what *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* suggests or calls for.

This probability, we readily confess, is not so strong that it migh not be over-balanced by the clear teaching of the Apostle, if suc could be proved, that Christ is not *θεός*. Nor is it so strong, that would be impossible to suppose an *unexpressed* contrast had been i the writer's mind—such, for example, as that, while on the *σάρξ* sid Christ came from the Jews only, on the *πνεῦμα* side he had relatio to Jews and Gentiles alike.* The probability, that is to say, do not reach the limits of certainty. But it is of such strength as to b worthy, as we have already said of that which exists respecting th

*That the unexpressed contrast here referred to is not the on intended by the Apostle, we think is rendered altogether probable b the following considerations: (*a*.) In the passage of this Epistle in whic the *πνεῦμα* side or relation of Christ is mentioned most distinctly, contrast with the *σάρξ* side or relation,—namely, Chap. i., vss. 3, 4, radically different sense belongs to *πνεῦμα*. That passage, however, it appears to us, is one in which the Apostle would have been mo inclined, than he would be here, to bring out the relation of the Lo Jesus to all men, in contrast to that in which he stood to the Jews alon He was there speaking of the Gospel and its proclamation to all th nations. He was intimating that the Old Testament Scriptures ha promised and prophesied it; a point which he subsequently develo as confirming the doctrine of salvation by faith for Jews and Gentil alike. To refer, under such circumstances, to Christ's relation to bo would not have been outside of the line of his thought. But in the vers before us he is confining himself to the Jews only, and is attempting meet a special difficulty as connected with the covenant of God, whic made them earnestly oppose his doctrine. In order to carry out h purpose, he is enumerating their privileges as a nation and the marke evidences of God's favor towards them. It is to them exclusively th his thoughts turn here, though they have turned to others elsewher If, in such a context, he says, Christ, who is in himself Divine, i by his human descent, from the Jews, it is in full harmony with a that he is thus setting forth. But a reference, even by implication, Christ's spiritual connection with all men, as distinguished from the alone, seems to break in discordantly upon his recital of their p culiar honors, and his defence of himself against their sensitivenes (*b*). Whatever we may hold with respect to the doctrine of His Deit we cannot but regard it as evident that, in general, when the *πνεῦ* side of Christ is spoken of or hinted at in the New Testament, in di tinction from the *σάρξ* side, the reference is to something internal himself, or belonging to his relations to God, and not to what is exte nal, appertaining to the connection which he has with all men opposed to that which he has with the Jewish race.

onstruction of ὁ ὤν, of very serious consideration. It passes the *urden of proof* over to the opposite view.

We cannot but regard the probabilities developed thus far in the scussion as cumulative. If what has been said (in Section I.) of ὤν is of weight, the probability that the clause beginning with those ords stands in a certain contrast to τὸ κατὰ σάρκα is strengthened by is fact.

III. The next point which demands our attention is the position the sentence of the word εὐλογητός. This word occurs just where e should expect to find it, provided the clause is descriptive of ριστός, but it does not have the place in the order of the sentence hich it regularly holds in doxologies. A new probability in favor f making the clause a descriptive relative one is derived from this ct.

To say, indeed, as many authors have done in the discussion of is verse, that this word, εὐλογητός, cannot possibly stand anywhere a doxological sentence of this character except at the beginning, is take an extreme position. It requires much boldness, as it seems us, to affirm, in respect to such a matter, what a writer *must* say, to declare what does not fall within the limits of possibility. Lanuage rises above rules at times. In some cases the form of expreson may depend, even to the violation of ordinary principles, on the eculiar shade of thought or point of view which characterizes a riter's mind at the moment. Especially may this be the case where he question is one of emphasis, and where emphasis is connected osely, as it is in the Greek language, with the arrangement of words.

But, setting aside the question of absolute impossibility in any onceivable case, the ordinary rule of the language undoubtedly is, at, in doxologies of an exclamatory character, and of this form, the oxological word has the first place. This rule is observed by all the riters in the New Testament and Old Testament, and in the O. . Apocryphal books, who use such sentences at all, and, among hers, by St. Paul himself. This rule seems, also, to be founded in ason, for it is in the very nature of such a sentence to put the examation at the beginning. The fact of the rule, (or custom, if so be called), and of its reasonableness will scarcely be questioned, nd therefore need not be proved. The only point to be determined whether there are exceptions, which show that, after all, the whole atter is dependent on mere chance emphasis in each particular case -so that the doxological word may have any position; but ordi-

narily has the first simply because, in ordinary cases, the main emphasis rests upon it.

The only exceptional case which is cited from the Scriptures by most writers, is Psalm lxvii. 20, in the Septuagint Version. We are convinced that this passage constitutes no proper exception to the rule, and that it has no bearing upon Rom. ix. 5. We do not say this, indeed, because of the reason which is urged by many; namely, that the LXX. translators misinterpreted the Hebrew. This we regard as no satisfactory account of the matter. They may have failed to understand the Hebrew, but they were familiar, doubtless, with Greek usage respecting such sentences; and their arrangement of the words is a thing wholly within the domain of the Greek language. The fact remains that, in a Greek sentence, they have put εὐλογητός in another than the first place.* But when we examine this passage closely, we find that it differs from ordinary doxologies in an important particular. It is a two-fold sentence, having a double or repeated doxology, such as does not occur elsewhere, either in the Old Testament or the New. The verse reads in the LXX., κύριος ὁ θεὸς

* The peculiarity of this verse in the Septuagint is supposed by Schultz who favors the reference of Rom. ix. 5, to Christ, and is admitted by Grimm, who opposes this reference, to be due to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew after the following manner. The Hebrew suggests as the true translation, Thou hast gone up to the high place, thou hast captured a captivity, thou hast taken gifts among mankind and even among rebels,—to dwell as Jah, God. Blessed be the Lord day by day. The LXX. translators, not comprehending the meaning, rendered the words with a slavish literality and adherence to the Hebrew order, καὶ γὰρ ἀπειθοῦντες τοῦ κατασκηνῶσαι κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός—κύριος ἡμέρας καθ' ἡμέραν. Being unable, with this reading of the sentence, to connect the phrase κύριος ὁ θεός with what precedes, they concluded that it must be connected with εὐλογητός as a doxology; and, accordingly they inserted another εὐλογητός to meet the necessity of a verbal word for the second κύριος. This explanation is, perhaps, the most satisfactory one which can be given. But, if it be adopted, we must notice that it involves the supposition that the LXX. translators, when they failed to understand the verse in the original, considered with some carefulness what they could do with it, and only after such consideration inserted the second doxological word. They, thus, deliberately arranged a Greek sentence in this order; and, accordingly, we must hold that they felt the order to be not forbidden by the rules of the language. For this reason, as it appears to us, the mere statement that the Seventy misinterpreted the Hebrew is not sufficient to account for their arrangement of the words in this verse of the Psalms.

γητὸς, εὐλογητὸς κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν. In double sen-
ces of this kind, there is an altogether peculiar rule of emphasis,
ich conflicts with, and may overpower, the rule prevailing in single
lamatory clauses. The rule to which we refer is, that, in such
es, the two parts of the sentence are so arranged that the correspond-
or contrasted words are placed either at the end of the first and be-
ning of the second part; or at the beginning of the first and end
the second. The frequency with which this rule is observed by
eek writers will not have escaped the notice of any one who is
iliar with their works. It is observed, as we may not doubt, by
LXX. translators here. Their desire was to set forth the em-
sis on εὐλογητός in this passage in the strongest way. How could
y best accomplish this end? How could they, in the twofold
tence with its parallel clauses, give to the doxological words that
minence which in a single exclamatory sentence is secured by
cing it at the beginning? Evidently, by arranging the clauses
cisely as they have done. For this reason, as we may believe,
y adopted this method; and, in adopting it, they sought to bring
what in single clauses they attained in another way. If they had
nslated the Hebrew accurately, with only one doxology, they would,
ubtless, have expressed the emphasis as the Hebrew does in this
se, and as they themselves do everywhere else in the Psalms, by
cing εὐλογητός at the beginning. So far, then, from being an ex-
tion which proves that the doxological word may stand after the sub-
of the sentence, as Winer and others maintain, this verse from the
tuagint, in our judgment, strengthens the opposite view, inasmuch
t shows that, even in this peculiar case, this word is made to have
greatest possible prominence.*

* In contrast with those who would make Ps. lxvii. 20, Sept., a case in
of of the application of εὐλογητός in an exclamatory doxology to a
ject which precedes it, Lange and Canon Farrar hold that St. Paul,
our present verse, is only echoing the passage from the Psalms and
ng it to set forth the exaltation of Christ. They found their opinion
the fact that, in Eph. iv. 8, the Apostle cites a part of the next pre-
ling verse, (Thou hast ascended on high, &c.), in reference to him.
Do we not plainly hear the reëcho of this passage," says Lange, "in
ὃ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων? And since we know that Paul applies this passage
the glorification of Christ, is it not clear that he immediately adds
t ascription of praise in the Psalm? His expression occupies the
ddle ground between the LXX. and the Hebrew text." This reason-
seems to be inconclusive. The apostle, undoubtedly, uses the words
Ps. lxvii. 19, Sept., in the Epistle to the Ephesians, with reference to

One or two passages additional to this one from the Psalms hav been cited, for a similar purpose, by individual writers who hav discussed the subject. Thus Prof. Grimm, in an article in th *Zeitschrift fur Wissenschafiliche Theologie* for 1868–9, refers to th Apoc. Psalms of Solomon, viii. 40, 41, where we find *αἰνετὸς κύρι ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν αὐτοῦ ἐν στόματι ὁσίων, καὶ σὺ εὐλογημένος Ἰσραὴλ ὑ κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.* Gen. xxvii. 29 is mentioned in a note appende to Prof. Andrews Norton's *Statement of Reasons.* Here the word are *ὁ καταρώμενός σε ἐπικατάρατος· ὁ δὲ εὐλογῶν σε, εὐλογημένη ξ.* will be observed that, in both of these cases, we have double sen tences, and consequently sentences in which we may discover pecul arities as distinguished from simple ones. The former of the tw though not precisely similar to Ps. lxvii. 20, may be explained in th same way. There is, indeed, a kind of chiasmus here. As for th second, the same idea is repeated several times in the Old Testamen *e. g.* Gen. xii. 3, *εὐλογήσω τοὺς εὐλογοῦντάς σε, καὶ τοὺς καταρωμένους σε καταράσομαι,* Ps. cviii. 28, LXX., *καταράσονται αὐτοὶ καὶ σ εὐλογήσεις,* Num., xxiv. 9, *οἱ εὐλογοῦντές σε εὐλόγηνται καὶ οἱ καταρ μενοί σε κεκατήρανται.* The examination of these verses will sho that the writers seem to labor, in all possible ways, to bring out wha we may call the compound emphasis. The object, in all this effor is the same which, in a single clause, is reached in one way only The compound sentence, therefore, ceases to be a parallel to th simple one. It involves other and peculiar elements, and hence ma be subject to special rules appertaining to itself alone.

As a case where, *in a single clause,* the usual order is reversed, Gen xxvi. 29, has been referred to. The reading here in the commo text of the LXX. is *καὶ νῦν εὐλογημένος σὺ ὑπὸ κυρίου,* but accordin to some of the manuscripts it is *σὺ εὐλογητός.* The correct text is s uncertain as to make the evidence to be derived from it somewha doubtful. But, accepting the reading which places the subject firs

---

Christ. But there we find an evident citation. Here, on the contrar there is nothing to remind us of the precise words of the Psalm. Ca we infer from the fact that in another letter, written four or five yea afterwards to another Church, there is an application of a particula Psalm to our Lord, that there is, also, such an application in this lette when the Psalm itself is not quoted? St. Paul, in addressing th Ephesians, is speaking of another subject, he is presenting the exalta tion of Christ with reference to another end, he is employing differe expressions, he is calling the attention of his readers directly to the O T. words. The argument derived from what he says to them ca scarcely be of much force as bearing upon his language here.

think it may be questioned whether the sentence is an exclamatory , pronouncing Isaac blessed, and is not rather an affirmative one, ng a reason why the speakers had come to him for the purpose of king a covenant. If it is to be interpreted in the latter way, it s not belong in the doxological class.

We will not dwell upon the supposed exceptional cases further. prove that there is not even a single one within the limits of the ek language, may be difficult. But certainly the search for them not been an easy task, and, when the search has seemed to be arded by a discovery, the passage which is found has some peculiar racteristics rendering it hardly serviceable for the end in view. We y say, at least, that the cases are so exceedingly rare, that, when are moving in our argument, as we are now, within the region of babilities, and not affirming certainties, they afford little strength pposing the ground which we have taken.

Winer (see his N. T. Grammar, p. 551, Am. ed.) sets aside this ole matter of seeking for exceptional cases or denying their exist- e. He says, "Only an empirical expositor could regard this ition as an unalterable rule ; for when the subject constitutes the ncipal notion, especially when it is antithetical to another subject, predicate may and must be placed after it, cf. Ps. lxvii. 20, Sept. d so in Rom. ix. 5, if the words, ὁ ὤν, &c., are referred to God, position of the words is quite appropriate, and even indispens- e." Other writers have maintained substantially the same ground. will be convenient, in continuing our discussion, to make these narks of Winer the starting point for a few suggestions.

a.) We may admit that the rule of arrangement is that of em- asis. But the question before us is, in fact, this: Whether in such xological passages, having an exclamatory character, the doxolo- al word is not necessarily the emphatic one. The decision of this estion may not, indeed, be reached by the mere empirical ex- itor. But, if not, is he not, after all, working along a line of mination which ought to be followed ? Is not the determination universal usage a most important, not to say the conclusive, thing ? all writers pursue the same course, does not their unanimous ac- n carry with it the greatest weight, and show that there must be ne ground in the nature of things for their unanimity ?

b.) But, passing this point, let us look at Winer's more particular itions. These are that the doxological word *may,* and that it even *st,* stand after the subject, provided the subject constitutes the prin- al notion, and especially when it is antithetical to another subject. at the word *must,* in this statement, cannot be sustained, is, we

think, proved by such instances as LXX. Gen. xiv. 19, 20, 1 King xxv. 32, 33, where we have contrasted subjects, and, in the latter cas the σύ (vs. 33.) is the "principal notion" because of the clause ἀποκωλύσασα, etc., which contains the very ground and substance the whole exclamation. As for the word *may*, on the other hand, is, to say the least, not justified by Winer's cited example, Ps. lxvi 20; for, whatever else may be said of the passage, it presents no suc peculiar prominence of the subject. There seems to be no evidenc of any prominence at all in the subject, except the mere fact of th arrangement of the words. But to assume that this fact proves it, i in the first place, to assume the very point in dispute, and in th second place, to assume that no other reason can be given for th peculiar order.

(*c.*) Without, however, pressing this question of *may* and *must*, w ask what is the prominence of the subject in Rom. ix. 5, which ren ders it in such a degree the principal notion, that its position befo the doxological word is not only "quite appropriate," as Win maintains, but "even indispensable?" It must be, if we are guide by his paragraph quoted above, either (*x.*) because of a contrast wit something else in the passage,—which, it would seem, is either Chri or the Israelites, or (*y.*) because God is designated as the author the blessings and privileges mentioned in this verse and the precedin one, and that this authorship is the principal thought or notio With reference to *x.* we should say that there is no such contra here, and that, if there were, there are passages of sufficient numb in the Old Testament, in which, while the contrast is much mo marked and striking, the doxological word keeps its regular positio at the beginning of the clause, to show that the Biblical writers di not reverse the order in such cases, or regard the fact of a contra as having any influence towards a reversal. Compare, for exampl LXX. Gen. xiv. 19, 20, 1 Kings xxv. 32, 33, already referred to and, as furnishing quite as much of contrast as can possibly be foun in Rom. ix. 5, LXX. Ps. lxxxviiii; 53, whether we consider the co trast as with the enemies or the anointed, τοῦ χριστοῦ σου, (Ps.) th Israelites or Christ, (Rom.). In respect to *y.*, we should maintai that there are passages in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, whe the subject is clearly and emphatically the principal notion—as muc so as it is in our present verse—in which the writer, nevertheles places it after the doxological word. Compare 2 Macc. xv. 34, as marked instance. In this verse, as we see in view of the context, th chief idea, and the point and force of the offering of praise to Go are found in the words ὁ διατηρήσας τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον ἀμίαντον, as the

in ὁ ὤν, etc., according to Winer's statement, in Rom. ix. 5. It *the great act*, there as much as here, and so, we think, in LXX. Kings xxv. 33, and elsewhere, which calls forth the doxology, and no change in the order is made.*

d.) If it be said that these cases, and others which might be men-ned, do not correspond with the one now under discussion, because name of the subject is here *preceded* by a descriptive clause, ὁ ὤν, etc., ich marks the subject as the principal notion, it must be admitted t there is no passage in the Septuagint precisely corresponding, in s respect, with the present one. Can we believe, however, that, n Ps. lxxi. 18, Sept. for example, which now reads εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ὁ ποιῶν θαυμάσια μόνος, the writer had wished to only the phrase ὁ ποιῶν θαυμάσια θεός, instead of the words which does use, he would have been compelled, or, so far as we can ge, would have been disposed, to place εὐλογητός after it? Or, in, would it have been necessary to vary, in this respect, the order he sentence in Ps. cxvii. 26 Sept., if to the clause, as it now reads, ογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου the writer had desired to l words such as χριστὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας? It is true that the dox-gies in the Septuagint which introduce the word εὐλογητός have, in cases, the name of the subject immediately following this word, l, if a descriptive or causal clause occurs, it is added with ὅτι or ὅς l a verb, or with ὁ and a participle. But this fact seems to point, so much to an impossibility of placing such a descriptive phrase, nsisting of ὁ and a participle, before the name of the subject in h a sentence, but rather to the probability that, if St. Paul had hed to insert a doxology here, he would have adopted the course the LXX. translators, and would have written εὐλογητός first, θεός the second place, and then a participial clause with ὁ, or a verbal e with ὅς or ὅτι. The argument, thus, is rather unfavorable than orable to the supposition that the Apostle's words are designed to an ascription of praise to God the Father.

---

* As the doxological clause in 2 Macc. xv. 34 follows the verb εὐλόγησαν δὲ πάντες εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησαν τὸν ἐπιφανῆ κύριον, λέγοντες), nay, perhaps, be claimed that this verb requires the emphasis in the xology to be on εὐλογητός. If we admit this—which may be regarded doubtful, to say the least,—we may, nevertheless, confidently affirm, m the unvarying usage of the Septuagint, that the same arrange-nt of words would have been given, if the verb in question had not en in the text; and the passage remains, therefore, as a suitable one the purpose for which it is here used.

(*e.*) But if Rom. ix. 5, is a passage in which the writer desired to set forth a peculiar emphasis in relation to the subject, such as surpasses that which was aimed at in any doxological verse of the Old Testament; if this emphasis was to be connected with God's authorship of the blessings which had been given to Israel; and if the end was sought by placing the descriptive clause not merely before the name of the subject, but also before the doxological word; we cannot but think that he would have written, not what we have before us, but *τῷ δὲ ὄντι ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, (or, with another order *τῷ δὲ θεῷ τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων ὄντι δόξα*, etc.). He would have adopted this course, we think, for two reasons: *first*, because the almost or quite universal usage in such exclamatory doxologies, (as we see in all the Scriptural writers), would have led him to apprehend a possible misunderstanding of the clause, if put in its present form,—we say this of course, on the verbal and grammatical side, not on the doctrinal —and *secondly*, because the form of expression with the dative was well known to him and frequently used in his epistles, and, indeed, the most common form at the end of his paragraphs, while at the same time it would, if employed, be unmistakable in its meaning.

(f.) Before closing our remarks on this part of the subject, we would call attention to one further point. Meyer and some others maintain that the doxological passages in the LXX. which have the copula are, in no essential point, different from those which have not, so far forth as the matter now in hand is concerned. Hence they claim that all passages of this class, in which the subject precedes *εὐλογημένος*, are pertinent as bearing upon our present verse. The *εἴη* or *γένοιτο* or *ἔστω* in such sentences, it is affirmed, has no emphasis, and the position of the other words is determined by the fact that the stress falls rather upon the subject than the predicate. The passages of this character are the following: Ruth ii. 19, 2 Chron. ix. 8, Job i. 21, Ps. lxxi. 17, Ps. cxii. 2, Dan. ii. 20. A careful examination of these verses, in connection and comparison with others in which *εὐλογητός* or *εὐλογημένος* occurs without the copula, will show, we are confident, that there is no evidence that the subject has any more prominence in the one case than in the other. Compare LXX. Ps. lxxi, 17, for example, where we have *ἔστω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ εὐλογημένον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, with the same Psalm, verse 19, where the words are *εὐλογητὸν τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*. It is worthy of notice that, in all these cases, the Hebrew reads the verb, the subject and the doxological word in the same order,* while in the passages of the other class the doxological word

*In Ps. lxxii. (LXX. lxxi.) 17, the Hebrew omits the word *blessed*. "Let his name be for ever."

always placed first. Is not the true explanation of the matter the lowing: namely, that the LXX. translators strictly rendered the ebrew in both classes of sentences, and that both the Hebrew and ptuagint writers obeyed a natural law of language; the law that, in clamatory doxologies of this character, the doxological word holds e first position, but, where a copula is introduced, the doxological ord may follow the subject—even as we say, in English, Happy is e man, but, Let the man be happy, although the subject is no ore prominent, or the principal notion, in the one case than in the her.

We may remark here again, that the argument seems to be cumuive. The probability arising from the position of εὐλογητός, strong itself, is strengthened still further by its connection with ὁ ὤν,— the naturalness, that is, with which it is taken as a predicate after ;—and especially in view of the fact that in the other two instances which we have similar expressions in the Pauline Epistles, (Rom. 25, and 2 Cor. xi. 31), it is a predicate; in the former after ὅς ἐστιν, the latter after ὁ ὤν.

IV. The phrase ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων is, we think, more readily rred to Christ, in this connection, than to God, because, as descripe of the exaltation and glory of Christ, ἐπὶ πάντων is a very natural d suitable phrase, (as *e. g.* in Eph. iv. 6, with reference to the ather), but, as setting forth the fact that God's superintending prodence had allotted to the Israelites such blessings, it seems clear at some other expression would have been better adapted to convey e thought. Some other expression would, therefore, probably have een employed. That ἐπὶ πάντων *cannot* be used as relating to God view of the thought of this context, we would not affirm, as some ave been disposed to do. But the balance of probability is in favor the other reference.

It has been asserted, indeed, that ὤν would have been omitted, if e Apostle had intended to speak of God. We doubt the propriety this assertion. ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός and ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός are hrases which do not, or at least may not, have precisely the same eaning. St. Paul here, according to the rendering of the sentence hich is proposed for the marginal note by the American Revisers, ys, "he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever." For this exression the language used is perfectly fitted, and more so than ὁ ἐπὶ ντων θεός would be. We think it may be said in this connection, owever, that there is a somewhat greater naturalness in the use of the ords ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, as compared with ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, or ven ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων ὢν θεός, if the reference be to Christ.

Many writers have further claimed, that, if the clause were designed to be a doxology, a particle like δέ would be inserted at the beginning, so that it would read ὁ δὲ ὤν, etc. No doubt this is the common construction in such cases, and therefore there is a certain degree of probability, by reason of this fact, against the doxological interpretation here. But it must be remembered that St. Paul is a writer whose style is marked often by abrupt transitions. In the sentences of such a writer, particles of this sort may easily be omitted. The ardor of his feeling is manifested, at times, by the abruptness, and the emphasis is made stronger. A clear case of the omission of δέ under such circumstances may be found in 2 Cor. ix. 15, if we adopt the reading favored by the oldest manuscripts and approved by the best textual scholars.

In regard to the phrase now under consideration we may say that, at each point to which we have referred, there is a slight balance, at least, in favor of uniting it with χριστός. There is no difficulty as appertaining to the language used, if the words are taken as descriptive of Christ. The absence of δέ, the position of ὤν, and the ἐπὶ πάντων constitute reasons of some, even if it be but little, weight, as bearing against the independence of the clause and its separation from the preceding words.

We have, thus, examined the several parts of the passage which have any important bearing upon the decision as to its meaning: ὁ ὤν —ἐπὶ πάντων—εὐλογητός—τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. They, each and all, afford a probability that the clause relates to Christ. They point in one direction; and this wholly apart from doctrinal considerations,—in the region of language and grammar alone. We cannot say, indeed, that any one of these phrases presents an absolutely conclusive argument on this side of the question. Nor can we maintain, since a chain is no stronger than its links, that all the phrases, when taken together, constitute such an argument, or determine the reference to God to be *impossible*. At the same time, there is, if we may so express it, *a combined and compounded probability*, the force of which cannot easily be shaken, as it seems to us, and should not fail to be duly considered.

V. Beyond the words of the individual clause, their meaning and connection, there is one further point which deserves particular notice. The relation of the clause to the entire context may have an important influence in determining the intention of the author when he wrote it. In which direction does the context turn the balance of

robability? We think, towards the same reference, to which, as we ave already seen, the words direct us. The antecedent presumption om the surrounding verses is against a doxology to God in this place. ome have held that this presumption amounts to certainty. The troduction of such a doxology here, they assert, would be so un- itable as to render it quite impossible to suppose that the Apostle ould have thought of it for a moment. To us, however, this view ppears to be quite without foundation. Indeed, we cannot regard n ascription of praise to God as *especially* out of place at this point. t. Paul had been enumerating the peculiar blessings and honors of is own people, which had given them, as he rejoiced to feel, an exalted osition in the world. He was declaring his affection for them, and ie absence of all enmity even when compelled to say what might seem arsh and offensive. He was testifying to his sorrow for evil which efell them, and his joy and pride in all their history as evidencing God's vor. These are the thoughts of the first five verses of this chapter. Vhy could he not, and why should he not, at the close of these erses, and after the enumeration of these blessings, break forth into ie exclamation, "May he who is over all, God, be blessed for ver!" But, while we admit this, we must observe that the pro- ress of the author's thought is towards the sixth verse and what llows it, and that the balance of probability cannot be determined ithout considering the five verses in connection with the sixth and ie rest of the chapter. As we look at the matter from this point of iew, we find that the thought moves on in an easy and natural way, we make the reference of these words, which are under discus- on, to be to Christ. As I come now, (the Apostle says in sub- ance), after my preceding argument and discourse to speak of ie lapse of the Jews, I assure them that I do it with sorrow, ot with willingness; for how could I do it willingly, since they re my own countrymen, and are the people who have been hon- red by the possession of the law, etc., and by the fact that the *Divine* Christ entered into our world as one of their race;—and I ssure them also (vs. 6), that, in saying what I am compelled to say, do not mean that the covenant of God, which has given them all iese blessings, has failed or will fail. I only say, that it has been isapprehended in its true meaning and application by my country- ien. Understood in this way, everything becomes clear; the em- hasis throughout is just what we should anticipate; the relation of ie introductory verses to the main portion of the chapter is most ap- ropriate and most simple. If, on the other hand, we have a dox- logy at the end of the fifth verse, there is a certain arresting of the

thought and drawing aside of the mind, which, in a measure, breaks the closeness of the connection. Now, as the chapter is not written for the sake of the introduction, but the introduction for the sake of the chapter, it would seem that we ought to explain these verses, in every part of them, in the way which will place them most in harmony with what follows.

VI. If the considerations thus far presented are of weight, and the argument is, in some degree, cumulative as it proceeds, we may properly notice the fact before closing, that the writers of the Primitive Church, so far as they refer to this passage, seem almost uniformly to give the interpretation which applies the words to Christ. The value of patristic interpretation may be questioned, indeed, and in the case of some of the fathers it is possible that reasons may be suggested which influenced their minds, apart from the mere language which is used by the Apostle. But, whatever may be said in this way, and however we may estimate these writers, their substantial or complete unanimity is a circumstance which should not be disregarded. We do not insist on this point with urgency, because we cannot look upon it as having so much importance as it has appeared to many to have. As connected with and following upon what has been previously presented, however, we give the fact a place in the argument which we think it deserves.

We thus bring our presentation of the subject, so far as this side of the argument is concerned, to a close. There are considerations upon the other side, which demand notice, if our discussion is to be complete, or if it is to be carried forward with impartiality. To these we now turn our attention.

I. Looking simply at the matter of language—and apart from all doctrinal controversy—we see, it is said, that St. Paul does not use the word *θεός*, in any single instance unless it be here, with reference to Christ. This word is found in the Pauline Epistles about five hundred and fifty times. If among all these cases no one is discovered in which Christ is called *θεός*, outside of the verse before us, what is the inference as to this verse? Is it not, manifestly, that he is not so called here? The advocates of the interpretation which makes the clause a doxology to God press this question with much emphasis and confidence. They claim that the presumption in favor of their view, and against the application of the words to Christ, becomes at this point overwhelming; that it overbalances, indeed, everything which has been or can be urged upon the other side.

Estimate this presumption, however, as fairly as we may, it must be dmitted, we think, as has been already said with respect to some of ose mentioned upon the other side, that it does not amount to cer-inty. Certainty, in this connection, could come only from a posi-ve statement on the part of the Apostle, or, at least, of some writer the New Testament, that Christ is not θεός. But no such state-ent exists. It must also be admitted, we think, that, in and of self, it does not reach the highest limits of probability, for if in our udy of his writings we find, perchance, indications that divine tributes are ascribed by St. Paul to Christ, this fact may open the ay for our believing that he somewhere calls him God. Or if the ntence before us, on investigation, proves to present some difficul-es in the meaning of words or in construction, which are equally eat with any involved in supposing that the Apostle here de-ates from his uniform custom elsewhere, we must weigh these diffi-lties in the balance with this presumption, in order to our reaching ur final result.

So much may be said, even if there are no instances of this use of ός to be discovered. But in case our examination leads to the find-g of a few such instances, the argument now before us will, evi-ently, lose much, if not all, of its force. The presumption will nk into a far lower region of probability. This will be so, because e present sentence if interpreted of Christ will, under these circum-ances, be no longer distinguished from every other Pauline sentence. will be so, also, because, as it is antecedently to be expected that e word θεός will generally be applied to God the Father, even a nall number of examples of reference to Christ may justify us in suming such a reference, wherever the indications of the sentence self point in that direction. We are brought, therefore, to the in-uiry whether any such cases, which are in point, actually exist, or nether any considerations may properly be offered which tend to eaken or set aside the argument now before us.

The full and satisfactory examination in regard to the use of the ord θεός would involve a discussion of all the verses, in which it has een maintained that St. Paul applies it to Christ. Such a discussion, owever, would reach far beyond the limits of this paper. We can ly indicate, as briefly as possible, a few points which may have a aring upon the true view of the subject, and may help towards owing precisely what the strength or weaknesss of the presumption serted to exist here is. These points are the following:

(*a.*) In Acts xx. 28, the textual evidence is so strong in favor of οῦ that it is accepted as the true reading by prominent scholars, and

among them by Westcott and Hort, in their recently published edition of the Greek Testament. The English Revisers have retained the word *God* in their text. It must be admitted by all, that this may have been the original word, and that the other reading, κυρίου, cannot be considered as certainly to be substituted. The question, to say the most we can for that other reading, is nearly evenly balanced. Here, then, is one instance where we find a not improbable justification for explaining our present passage as having reference to Christ.

(*b.*) In Titus ii. 13, the arguments which are connected with the natural construction of the verse, favor the reference of θεοῦ to Christ. The ordinary grammatical rule, according to which two appellative words connected by καί under a common article belong to the same substantive, points to this application of the word. That this rule is universal, is denied. That it holds with regard to the verse in question, is not admitted by Winer and some others. The suggestions of Winer, however, in support of his view do not seem to be conclusive, when they are examined, and we are persuaded that the grounds for applying the rule in this verse have not been duly considered by most of those who have written upon the subject. The English Revisers, here also, have given in their text the rendering which assigns the name *God* to Christ.

(*c.*) The other verses from the Pauline Epistles which have been cited for the purpose of showing that this name is thus given, such as Col. ii. 2, Eph. v. 5, 2 Thess. i. 12, Tit. i. 3, we regard as having, according to the probabilities of the case, another interpretation. We, therefore, mention them only that it may not be supposed they have been overlooked, but do not rest the argument, in any measure, upon them. The first two of them, not to say all, may possibly be instances in point, but the possibility does not seem to reach the limits of probability. 1 Tim. iii. 16, can hardly be cited at all, since the true text is ὅς, not θεός, as the best critics now generally admit.

(*d.*) Whatever may be the final decision with regard to any or all of these passages, St. Paul unquestionably uses very strong expressions respecting Christ, which bear Him to an exaltation closely approaching to that which would be indicated by giving Him the name θεός, if, indeed, they do not fully reach it;—especially in Phil. ii. 6–8 and Col. ii. 9. He who "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God," and in whom "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," would seem to be worthy of the loftiest title. He has θεότης abiding in him: may he not somewhere be called θεός?

(*e.*) The Apostle John uses the word θεός of Christ in his Gospel, i. 1, xx. 28. If this be admitted, we must allow that the thought of

hrist as God was not foreign to the apostolic mind, and therefore, at it may not have been strange to Paul. We may notice, also, at St. John, though using this word about one hundred and fifty mes, applies it to Christ only twice, or, if xx. 28, is excluded, only nce. We find, thus, a fact in connection with his writings, which rresponds, in its measure, with what we see in St. Paul's Epistles, Rom. ix. 5 is the only instance of his employing θεός in this way. (*cf.*) This brings us to what we regard as an important suggestion, relating to the matter now before us. If St. Paul and the other postles believed that the word θεός was properly applicable to hrist, it is, nevertheless, not strange that they should have spoken him scores or hundreds of times as man, or as Messiah, while re-rring to him only in occasional instances as God. It was to be xpected, on the other hand, that this would be their course. Their ork, to which they devoted their energy and life, was, as we must member, to persuade their fellow men to accept as a Savior the an who had taught them, whose disciples they had been during His rthly ministry, and whom they had seen after His resurrection and he ascended towards heaven. The question whether he was God r not, however important in itself, was, in this view, a secondary and bordinate one. Those writers who have asserted that, if the New estament authors had accepted the doctrine of Christ's Divinity, ey would have declared it on every page, misapprehend, as it ap-ears to us, the position of these authors and the first and main object hich they had in view. As they besought those to whom they reached the Gospel to be reconciled to God, they set before them the Mediator through whom the reconciliation was made possible. They turally described him in this official and intermediate relation, as he peared on earth. They wrote about him as they preached, mainly his distinction from God and in his human manifestation, and ly in a far less degree did they feel impelled to discourse of his ion in being with God, or to give him the name of God. It was sus, whom they preached. If men would come in faith to Jesus, ey believed that they would gradually, if not at once, reach the ap-rehension that he was Divine. They called him, therefore, Jesus, hrist, Saviour, Mediator, Man, often and always. They called him od only here and there,—only, it may be, at very rare intervals.

The argument now under consideration is, in our judgment, the rongest one which can be brought forward against the reference of e clause before us to Christ. To those who present it, it appears nclusive. But, even if we admit that none of the passages cited om the Pauline writings prove that θεός is used of him, the points

to which we have called attention are, as it appears to us, of much importance. They show that, at the most, very few instances of such use are to be looked for, under any circumstances. They show, also, that St. Paul does not hesitate to employ expressions, which are little short of what this verse would mean, if interpreted as declaring that Christ is God. And, further, they show that one of the other Apostles makes this declaration, with the use of this word, only in one or two places, though he applies the word to God the Father as many times as Paul does in proportion to the extent of his writings. When we bear all this in mind, and remember that the naturalness of the construction in every part of the sentence points to the reference to Christ, the deviation from the Apostle's usual or uniform custom ceases to be so strange as it has been judged to be. Few passages in his Epistles, we must remember also, give a more fitting occasion than this for setting forth this exaltation.

II. It is urged as bearing against the reference of the words under discussion to Christ, that doxologies ascribing praise to him are not found in the Apostolic writings. On this point it may be said, (*a.*) that Rev. i, 6, v. 13, 2 Pet. iii. 18, are clear instances of doxologies to Christ. 2 Tim. iv. 18, is, also, another instance according to the view of commentators in general. Unless all these cases are set aside by denying the apostolic authorship of the books, the argument must be regarded as having no foundation. (*b.*) 1. Pet. iv. 11, and Heb. xiii. 21, are passages in which such doxologies may possibly be found. If so,—the former is from a book whose author was, in all probability, an apostle. We do not, however, press these cases in the discussion, for we consider them as referring, most probably, not to Christ, but to God the Father. (*c*) But, whatever may be the result of our search for examples, it is clear that the Apostles speak in the most exalted language of Christ. St. Paul himself unites him with God the Father, in the Apostolic Benediction. He calls him the Lord of glory; the image of God; the Lord from heaven; the Lord of the living and the dead; God's own Son. He represents him as before all things; as the one through whom are all things; as sustaining all things; as having a name that is above every name; as the one to whom all things in heaven and earth and under the earth are to bow. He declares that he was in the form of God; that he is now at the right hand of God; that in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge; and that he is raised far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come. That one who

ys all this should somewhere pass the limits of ordinary language, ıd even call him *God*, would hardly surprise us. It would seem to e no more than a fit description of his glory. But much more may e regard it as quite consistent for such a writer, in a passage like om. ix. 5, to use a word ascribing to him *praise and blessing*, even no instance can be found where a *formal doxology* occurs. There e not more than ten such doxologies, it may be noticed, in all the auline Epistles. There are only two, (2 Cor. i. 3, Eph. i. 3.) here this word εὐλογητός is used.

III. But not merely is the doxological character of the sentence ade a ground of rejecting the appplication of it to Christ. The ord εὐλογητός itself is not used anywhere in the New Testament as lating to him; and this circumstance is adduced to show the im-robability that he is referred to here. The facts with regard to this atter are these. There are but seven instances of the use of this ord, outside of the present verse, in the entire New Testament. here are but four in St. Paul's Epistles. The kindred word εὐλογη-ένος, occurs in only eleven cases, and six or seven of these are mere petitions of a single quotation from the Psalms. In this repeated cita-on and in one other passage, εὐλογημένος, which is elsewhere used of ıman beings, is applied to Christ. In Mark xiv. 61, on the other ınd, Christ is called "the Son of the Blessed;" ὁ εὐλογητός being nployed as a designation of God. With respect to these facts we ay remark, (*a.*) that the number of examples of the use of εὐλογητός ems insufficient to determine usage as invariable,—to the exclusion even an individual case; (*b.*) that the application of εὐλογημένος, (as stinguished from εὐλογητός), to Christ in six repetitions of an Old estament verse can scarcely prove that a writer could not make use the other word in a seventh instance, if he should desire to do so; .) that the two words are found in the Old Testament referring both God and men, with a somewhat greater freedom than we discover the very few passages occurring in the New Testament; (*d.*) that, the case cited from Mark's Gospel, the language is that of the wish High Priest who was evidently referring to the declarations of sus, that He was the Son of God; and that we cannot fairly con-ıde from this phrase as thus employed, that, to the Apostolic mind, λογητός was an inappropriate word to apply to Christ; (*e.*) and, ıally, that,—considering the very limited amount of evidence which n be brought forward respecting this word, as found in the New estament books,—the fact that in the only two places similar to the ıe now under consideration, in which St. Paul uses the word,

(namely Rom. i. 25 and 2 Cor. xi. 31), it is a predicate descriptive of the subject, is deserving of special notice.

IV. The distinction made between God and Christ in 1 Cor. viii. 6. and Eph. iv. 5, 6, is urged as inconsistent with the interpretation of the clause before us as referring to Christ. Undoubtedly, a distinction is set forth in those verses. But it does not seem to follow from this fact, necessarily, that a similar distinction must be made here. If we suppose Christ to be θεός, it cannot be regarded as impossible, or even improbable, that an Apostle should desire at one time to speak of God and Christ in their separate positions and relations, and at another should wish to describe Christ in himself alone. Nor is it unreasonable to suppose, that, in the former case, he should represent Christ as κύριος, and God the Father as θεός, adding ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν, as Paul does in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and that, in the latter, he should say of Christ ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, as in Rom. ix. 5. That the verses cited have no bearing on the question, we would not affirm. They suggest a certain degree of probability, that the present verse ought to be interpreted as they must be. But we cannot regard them as having any considerable weight, because, on the supposition just made, it becomes so easy to explain the different cases on different grounds, and, thus, to show that they may have no complete parallelism.

The points which we have presented on this side of the question, like those on the other side which were previously stated, are in the region of language and its use by the Apostle, and not in that of doctrine. We legitimately investigate the writings of an author and try to determine what his usage is, if we are in doubt respecting the significance or the application of words in a particular passage. So we ordinarily do in the case of a classical Greek writer. So we may, with equal propriety, do when interpreting St. Paul's Epistles. If we find, on such investigation, that he never uses θεός elsewhere as applied to Christ; that he never employs the word εὐλογητός when speaking of him; that doxologies to Christ are not discoverable in his writings; and that, in certain noticeable passages where a distinction is made between him and the Father, the Father only is called ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων; it will scarcely be denied that all these things, when taken together, present a strong probability that a passage which involves these several words and expressions is not a description of Christ, but a doxology to God the Father. We have seen, however, as we think, that, with regard to the last three of these points, the impression

ch the first statement of them may make upon the mind, is dimin-
d in its force, not to say entirely removed, when we come to con-
r them more carefully. We may argue usage from five hundred
nples with some reason, but from four cases in which Paul has
γητός, or ten doxologies all referring to God, we cannot infer a
of language, from which he could nowhere deviate for what
ned to him sufficient grounds. He certainly sets forth Christ as
hy of glory and honor, if he does not put his words in the form of an
nary doxology. He does put them in this form, if the passage in the
ond Epistle to Timothy, already cited, is allowed as referring to
st and as written by the Apostle. Moreover, the distinction made
veen Christ and God in a few passages does not force us to the
clusion that there may not be a union between them, so that,
n the former point is before the mind, one Lord and one God are
tioned apart, but, when the other thought is prominent, the one
d receives the Divine name, which belongs to him as Divine.

We are left, therefore, for the main support of the position as-
ed upon this side of the question in dispute, to the first of the four
uments presented,—namely, that with reference to the word θεός.
force of this argument, we think we may justly say, is very greatly
kened by the suggestions which have been already made respect-
it. We are not disposed to deny, however, that it is deserving
areful consideration on the part of all who, in their study of the
age, honestly seek for the truth.

will be noticed as a somewhat singular fact, as we review these
ral grounds which are rested upon by the advocates of the refer-
e of the words to God the Father, that they are all connected with
derived from the general usage of the Apostle. They are, thus,
ght to bear upon the meaning of the passage from sources
ch are outside of it. The grounds, on the other hand, which
e allege who would make the sentence descriptive of Christ, fall
in the limits of the construction of the passage itself. Argu-
nts of both sorts are legitimate, and may be of great value and
t strength. But in general, as we think, those which belong to
words themselves, as they stand before us, will carry with them
greater weight, because a writer may turn aside from his ordinary
ge, or even start a new one, in some particular sentence. What a
er's usage is, we determine only by the observation of a certain
nber of known cases. Whether in a new and hitherto unob-
ed case he accords with what we have found elsewhere, depends
he possibilities or the probabilities of the phenomena presented by

it (that is, its own words and the rules of construction), and on th reasons which may have easily influenced him at the time of writing

In the present case, all the arguments which are founded upon th probabilities of construction, and of the meaning of individual words point towards interpreting the sentence as referring to Christ. Thes arguments, also, grow in strength as we pass from one to another, fo each new one seems to gain something from its connection with thos which precede it. Combined in their force, they press us to the con clusion that this is the correct interpretation. We find them oppose by only one, which stands the test of examination. This one, lik all which are brought forward in union with it, is derived from th alleged unvarying custom of the Apostle elsewhere, to use a particu lar word or phrase in a particular way. But, considering all that ha been said respecting this word, as connected with the exalted idea c Christ which the Apostle sets forth in language bearing the highes meaning, this argument does not seem to meet the full force of thos which it opposes. It leaves the mind of the student or reader, there fore, to follow the pathway to which they point, and, thus, to inter pret as the English text reads: "of whom is Christ as concerning th flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever."

At the same time, so long as this argument from usage retain any considerable measure of its weight, the candid scholar must feel we think, that a marginal rendering ought to be given. The Englis reader should, by this means, be put in possession of the knowledg of the fact, that the Greek words may possibly have another meanin —that they *may* refer not to Christ, but to the Father. The Reviser on both sides of the ocean have only been faithful to the demands lai upon them, as they have introduced such a marginal rendering int their amended version. It is idle to say, as a distinguished Englis writer and bishop has recently done, that the translation which make these words a doxology to God the Father is "a mere evasion of acut minds, occupied by dogmatic prepossessions against the Divinity c Jesus." The discussion of the subject in this paper has been wholl in the field of language and grammar. It has occupied itself with th meaning of words, the construction of sentences, and the usage of th writer; and with these things only. But it has shown that there is a uncertainty in the very form of expression which the Apostle her uses, and that the clause allows two different explanations. It ha shown, also, that these have just grounds on which to claim attention

he question ceases to be one of certainties, and becomes one of robabilities. The probabilities turn towards the reference to Christ, deed, if our argument has been correct, but not so completely d overwhelmingly as to make it right to ignore the other view together. In their Preface to the Revised Version the Revisers say, We have placed before the reader in the margin other renderings an those which were adopted in the text, wherever such renderings emed to deserve consideration." The rule for their action was the ly proper one for them to adopt. Their insertion of a marginal te at this verse was in accordance with a proper application of the le.

If, now, we regard it as established that the text of the Revised ersion gives that interpretation of the passage which, by its greater robability, deserves to be preferred, and yet that some form of words tting forth the other meaning should be added in the margin, the uestion arises as to what this form should be. Should it be that hich the American Revision Company have suggested, or one, or deed all, of those presented by the English Company? A few ords in answer to this inquiry seem to be required.

There are two points here, which deserve to be noticed. The first as reference to the words which introduce the marginal rendering. he English Revisers have deviated here from their universal custom sewhere, and have attributed the translations which they record in eir margin to "some modern interpreters." This appears to us nproper for two reasons: (*a.*) because the ground on which the ren- ering of the text throughout the New Testament is preferred, or that n which a marginal interpretation is added, is not that ancient riters have favored it, but that fidelity to truth demands it; and (*b.*) ecause the insertion of these words *in this place alone* is calculated to ve the ordinary reader an impression that the early fathers were etter interpreters than modern scholars, which is not in accordance ith the facts of the case. If this verse calls for an alternate render- g at all, it calls for it on similar grounds to those which occasion ther alternate renderings, and it ought to be introduced, as all others re, by *Or.* The American suggestion, so far as this point is con- rned, is surely the proper and right one.

The second point has reference to the different modes of translating, we refer the clause to God. The English present three modes, two hich place a period after *flesh;* and one which puts a comma after *esh*, and a period after *all.* The renderings, then, are, as mentioned t the beginning of this paper:

(*a.*) Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh. He who is God over all be (is) blessed for ever.

(*b.*) Of whom, &c. He who is over all is God blessed for ever.

(*c.*) Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all. God be (is) blessed for ever.

The American body propose to substitute for all these a fourth form:

(*d.*) Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh: he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever.

Of these four forms which one deserves to be preferred? The fourth, as it seems to us. Let us compare it with each of the others and, in the first place, with (*c.*). It must be admitted that (*c.*) has two advantages, as contrasted with (*d.*)—namely, it allows the natural and easy connection of *ὁ ὤν* with *χριστός*, and it affords a contrast to *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*. But, on the other hand, with this punctuation of the sentence, (1.) the doxology becomes much more abrupt; (2.) it loses all presentation of the ground for its introduction; (3.) it seems to be even less in the line of the Apostle's thought, than if (*d.*) be adopted; (4.) it furnishes no account of the position of *εὐλογητός*, after the subject; and (5.) it involves a difficulty of some moment in the absence of the article with *θεός*. For these reasons we think it must be rejected, as being less probably than (*d.*) the true construction, in case the word *θεός* refers to God the Father.

As compared with (*b.*), it appears to us that (*d.*) is decidedly to be preferred. (*b.*) is rather a formal statement of a fact, "He who is over all is God blessed for ever;" (*d.*) is an expression of feeling, an ascription of praise. The latter is both more in accordance with the course of the author's thought and language in the preceding verses, and is less difficult of explanation so far as the formation of the sentence itself is concerned. In the preceding verses the Apostle has exhibited strong feeling, and has set forth the honors of his own people. To break out into a doxology is not altogether unnatural under the circumstances. To frame his doxology in this form, "May he *who is over all*, God, be blessed forever," is singular, indeed, but not inexplicable. In the ardor of feeling and outburst of praise, he might express his idea of God's providential care and blessing by the words *who is over all.* But if he is framing a proposition and declaring a fact, it scarcely seems probable that he would have used this language, which is certainly not the most appropriate to the thought. He would more naturally, and therefore more probably, have said, *who is the author of these blessings*, or *who has bestowed so much upon Israel.* Moreover, the mere formal statement, that he

no gave the gifts, or he who is over all, is God, seems unnecessary
d altogether unlikely to have been made between verse fifth and
rse sixth. Any one who will compare the passage with 2 Cor. i.
, 22, will appreciate, we think, the fitness of the expression there
ed, and the unfitness of such an expression here.

If, then, the sentence refers to God, it must be regarded, in our
dgment, as a doxology in the ordinary and strict sense, *God be blessed*,
d the doxology must include all the words, and not θεὸς εὐλογητὸς
ς τοὺς αἰῶνας only.

But, admitting both of these points, are the words to read as in
.) or as in (*a*.)? We think that here, again, (*d*.) is to have the
eference. By adopting (*d*.) we have the sentence in a form which
ay possibly present that emphatic prominence of the subject which is
aimed as the reason for placing it before the doxological word.
He who is over all, God," can perhaps describe God as the object
praise because his providential rule has bestowed the blessings.
He who is God over all" is a phrase, on the other hand, more
turally adapted to express the simple idea of God's exaltation and
minion.

The suggestion of the American Revisers, therefore, is the one
hich seems most deserving of adoption for the marginal note. The
terpretation, however, which places the period after πάντων, and
nnects "who is over all" with Christ,—making the doxology to be
od be blessed for ever,—may also be worthy of record in the Revision.
ut this must be considered as doubtful.

We close our paper with two or three remarks not in the imme-
ate line of the argument.

First. It is not vital to the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ to
nd the declaration that he is God in this verse. The Apostle Paul
ay have believed that his Lord and Saviour was Divine, and may
ach this in his Epistles; and yet he may have chosen to limit him-
lf in the use of the name, *God*, so far as to apply it to the Father
nly. If, then, it be discovered, beyond question, that he never in
ny single instance uses the word θεός of Christ, the doctrine may
ll be unshaken. The more careful and systematic study of the
ew Testament has been showing the Christian Church, in recent
nes, that its truths are founded less upon individual verses or proof
xts, and more upon the great and pervading thought which fills all
s books. In this great and pervading thought, as relating to our
rd, we find the declaration of his Divine nature; a declaration
hich stands fast and abides, though the interpretation of particular

sentences may change as time passes on. If, however, this verse does contain the apostolic testimony that Christ is God, it is a direct affirmation of what the opposite doctrine would deny, and excludes that doctrine altogether.

We may add, in this connection, that, if the doctrine of Christ's divinity be established from other passages or other parts of the New Testament, this fact, by itself, will not prove that θεός here refers to him. It will only add to and confirm the probability derived from the examination of the verse, that it has this reference.

Secondly. The presentation of the subject, which has been made, shows the groundlessness and inappropriateness of the extreme assertions which have been indulged in by advocates of both views of this passage. It has been declared, on the one hand, by those who refer the words to Christ that the rules of construction absolutely exclude any other reference; that doctrinal prejudice alone has been the cause of any denial of this explanation; that there is no ground for such denial which is founded in reason; that it argues mental or moral blindness, even, to support the opposite view. On the other hand, it has been affirmed that the interpretation which does not apply the sentence to God as a doxology is impossible, if the rules and principles of the Greek language are considered; and that it is, indeed, little short of absurd. The fair and unprejudiced consideration of the words draws us away from all such extravagant statements, and brings us to the calm inquiry into the arguments for both sides, and the decision as to the probabilities within the sphere of language and grammatical construction. The presence of the two renderings in the Revised Version, as it comes into general use, will tend to make all theologians and readers recognize that there is a possibility of both renderings, while yet there is a probability that the one given in the text is correct.

Thirdly. It is a fact worthy of notice, that of the most prominent opponents of the reference of the passage to Christ—such writers, for example, as de Wette, Grimm, Rückert, Meyer, Jowett—each one admits a peculiar force as belonging to some particular argument among those which are urged in favor of that reference. Rückert says, that the naturalness of the connection of ὁ ὤν with χριστός points strongly towards this understanding of the clause, and that the sentence moves on most fitly and satisfactorily in this way. de Wette remarks that the demand for a contrast, which is found in τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, is the point of most difficulty to be overcome, and he evidently regards it as of serious moment. Jowett expresses the opinion that the omission of the verb, "the defective and awkward grammar,"

:he strongest objection to the interpretation as a doxology to God. imm states that the inappropriateness of using *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων*, in s connection, with respect to God—that is, as describing his rela- n to the blessings of the Israelites—is the thing which holds his nd back from applying the phrase to God. Meyer allows the force everything, as it were, except for the want of instances elsewhere which the Apostolic writers use *θεός* of Christ. We cannot but ɣard the fact that these scholars find a strength in the various argu- ɛnts, which it is hard to overcome—one looking upon one point as esenting very serious difficulty, and another upon another, until, as : read what is said by them all, we see that they are pressed by the ight of all the considerations—as showing that there is a real force each one, taken by itself, and a cumulative force in the sum of em, when united together. If such advocates of the opposite view knowledge that the argument, from stage to stage, causes even emselves to give it their most respectful consideration, the position those who interpret the clause of Christ must be a strong one, and e reasons which support it must be such as ought to influence can- d minds.

We have set forth these reasons and defended this position, with a ıe estimate as we trust, and with a fair presentation, of what is ged upon the other side. The interpreter is called, by the very ıties and obligations of his profession, to be a calm, honest, unpre- diced inquirer after truth—to be a judge, not an interested ad- ıcate.

A Paraphrase of the Song of Deborah.

BY PROF. THOMAS H. RICH.

That the strong in Israel laid bare their strength ;
That the people came to battle willingly ;
Praise ye the Lord !

Hear, O ye kings of earth ! ye princes, lend your ear !
I, of the Lord, I fain would sing; would touch the harp,
In honor of the Lord, the God of Israel !

Lord, when Thou wentst our from Seir ;
When Thou didst march from Edom's field ;
Earth quaked ; yea, heaven dissolved ;
Yea, clouds dissolved in rain !
Mountains shook at presence of the Lord ;—
Sinai there, at presence of the Lord,
The God of Israel !

In days of Shamgar, Anath's son ;
In days of Jael, idle lay the ways ;
And such as follow trodden paths,
Went ways circuitous.
Idle lay the villages in Israel—idle,
Until I, Deborah, arose—arose,
And like a mother wrought for Israel.

He chose new gods ;
Then war was at his gates ;
Nor shield appeared, nor lance,
'Mong Israel's forty thousand men.

My heart goes out to the leaders of Israel ;
To the people that came to battle willingly ;
Praise ye the Lord !

Ye, who on white asses ride ;
Ye, who on rich carpets sit ;
And ye, who tread the way, in toil for bread ;
Muse on the victory !
For voice of archers at the water troughs—
There be rehearsed the righteous acts the Lord hath done ;
His righteous acts done for his villages in Israel.
Then from their refuges on high,
The people of the Lord came to their gates again,
No foe to fear !

Awake, Deborah, awake !
Awake, awake, the triumph sing !
Up, Barak, Abinoam's son,
And lead thy captives to captivity !

Then, a remnant of the nation's noblemen,
Down to the battle came ;
The Lord among those heroes—joy to me—
Came down to Jezreel !
From Ephraim—they rooted in Mount Amalek.
Next thee Benjamin, joined with thy hosts.
From Machir, leaders with their trains came down ;
And out of Zebulon they onward march,
With captain's staff.
And princes of Issachar with Deborah league ;
And Issachar like Barak brave,
Down to the vale his feet impel.

By streams of Reuben, were determinations great.
Why tarrying still amid the fold ?
Is bleat of flock so sweet to hear ?
At streams of Reuben, were deliberations great ;
But none the battle sought !

Gilead beyond Jordan rests ;
And Dan—why sojourns he in ships ?
Asher by the seashore abides,
And at his havens resteth quietly.

Zebulon is a people that accounts it nought to die !
And Naphtali, of mountain home !

Kings came ; they fought.
Then kings of Canaan fought ;
At Tanaach, by waters of Megiddo—
Spoil of silver failed to take !
The Heavens against them fought ;

The stars their courses left to fight with Sisera.
Kishon's brook swept them away—
Brook of ancient days—Kishon's brook.
My soul contemns their strength !

Then hoofs of horses smote the ground ;
For on and on their warriors dashed—
A troubled multitude !

Curse ye Meroz, saith the Angel of the Lord ;
Curse, curse ye her inhabitants,
Coming not to help the Lord—
To help the Lord amid the heroes of the land.

Jael, Kenite Heber's wife—
Let her, beyond women blessed be !
Beyond women, who in tents abide,
Let her blessed be !
Water he asked, she gave him milk ;
In costly bowl she offered cream.
But deep his sleep, within her tent,
Her hand out to the nail she stretched,
And her right hand to hammer used in toil ;
And hammered Sisera ; she brake his head ;
And crushed, and pierced his temples through.
At her feet he sank, he fell, he lay ;
At her feet he sank, he fell ;
Where he sank, there he fell—a *worthless* thing.

Through the window there looks forth, and cries aloud—
Through the lattice—the mother of Sisera :
Why does his chariot delay to come !
Why step his steeds so slow !

The wisest of her princesses reply—
But her own word she still repeats unto herself—
" Surely they booty find and share ;
A maiden, two maidens, for each man ;
Booty of garments bright for Sisera ;
Booty of garments bright, with needle wrought ;
A garment bright, on both sides wrought—
Booty for me to wear !

So perish *all* who hate Thee, Lord !
But them who love Him—
Let them like the sun go forth,
In strength of victory !

The Babylonian Element in Ezekiel.

BY PROF. C. H. TOY, D. D.

§ I. EZEKIEL'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS BABYLON.

. The almost complete silence of the earlier prophets, down to end of the 7th century, B. C., in respect to the Babylonian king-n, is what we should expect from the political relations of the e, and the method of the prophetic exhortations. The prophets e practical preachers and statesmen, who dealt with foreign nations as these came into actual contact with Israel, and from the time of os to that of Jeremiah Babylon was merely a restless, hardly-man-l dependency of Assyria, with no important independent political er, not formidable as an enemy, or valuable as a friend. After ous revolts and wars it was finally completely subdued B. C., by Sargon, who took the title of King of Babylon, and held his rt in the city probably for several years; and it seems to be just at time that Micah declared (ch. iv. 10) that Judah should be carried y out of the city into the country and as far as Babylon. It was long after the destructive expedition of Sargon into southern Pal-ne, which filled the land with dismay (B. C. 712 or 711), and was improbably connected with the embassy of Marduk-bal-iddin (Isa. ix.), who before his last, ill-fated struggle for independence, may e wished to gain the friendship of the petty kings of Palestine. genuineness of the prediction ascribed to the prophet Isaiah in xxxix., 2 Kings xx. may fairly be regarded as doubtful, seeing this whole historical insertion (chs. xxxvi.–xxxix.) bears the ks of a later date, and the book of Kings belongs to the period of exile. The mention of Babylon in Micah, then, the only one ainly earlier than Jeremiah, is nothing but a consequence of the porary position of the King of Assyria in that city, and has nothing o with a kingdom of Babylon. The sole mention of this last und in the prediction of Isaiah, if this be genuine.

2. In B. C. 625 the Assyrian empire fell before the attack of th Medes and Babylonians, who divided its territory between them, Pa estine naturally falling to the latter; Josiah, King of Judah, becam a vassal of Babylon and lost his life in an attempt to prevent Pharao Necho from marching against his suzerain. The prophet Jeremiah as sumed the same friendly attitude towards Babylon, opposed with a his might alliance with Egypt and rebellion against Nebuchadrezza wrote to the captives to make themselves at home in the land of the exile, and carried his advocacy of the Babylonian supremacy so far a to incur the suspicion of treachery to his own country, and the heart hatred of the national party. He spoke no word against Babylon but predicted a speedy return of Israel to their own land.

3. On this point Ezekiel is completely at one with Jeremiah— while he looks to his people's restoration to Canaan, he is tho oughly friendly to Babylon. He sides with Nebuchadrezzar again Egypt and Tyre—promises to the Babylonian King the spoil of th latter (xxvi. 7–14), and when his attack had failed* gives him Egyp in compensation (xxix. 18–20). In portraying the attack of Gog o Israel, the allies whom he assigns to the northern horde are nearl identical with the allies of Tyre the enemy of Nebuchadrezzar. H has no word of blame or reproof for the King of Babylon—h does not denounce him for holding Israel in captivity—when th tidings of the fall of Jerusalem come, it is not against the conquero but against Israel that he lifts up his voice (xxxiii. 21–29)—the judg ment of God on Ammon, Moab, Edom and Philistia is announce for their hostility to Israel, but there is no word of judgment o Babylon. This forbearance is extended to the Babylonian religion The idolatry of Israel is denounced, the idols of Egypt are to be de stroyed, but Bel and Nebo and Marduk, Nebuchadrezzar's specia god are unmentioned.

4. All this is in striking contrast with the tone of later prophecies as Jer. l,. li.; Isa. xiii., xiv., xlvi. xlvii, in which Babylon is treated a the enemy of Israel, and therefore to be punished with destruction.

5. The difference of tone is explained by the difference of the his torical circumstances. To Jeremiah and Ezekiel Babylon was th supreme political power of the world, victorious over all enemies, firml established, and therefore the safest guardian of Israel. They sa that it would be madness in a petty kingdom in Palestine to set itse

*Whether Nebuchadrezzar took Tyre or not (on which point Josephus citation of authorities seems to me to amount to little), still th prophet says that neither he nor his army had wages for his servic against Tyre.

against this overwhelming force. They believed that God's prov-ence now pointed to submission; that, as he used the Babylonian ng to chastise sinful Israel, so he had his own plans for the restora-n of his people to national dignity and righteous prosperity, and at those plans could be carried out only by yielding to the superior ength of Babylon, repenting of sin, turning to Yahwe and hus-nding the national resources for the future.

The aspect of things naturally changed when Cyrus entered on his nquering career, and approached the Euphrates. The prophets oked on him as the agent of the glorious deliverance that God had in re for Israel. Babylon, on the other hand, was now regarded as the pressive power that held the chosen people back from the enjoy-ent of its rights—this power must be crushed in order that Israel y be restored. In the second Isaiah and Jer. l. and li. there is no endly feeling for Babylon, nothing but bitter reproach for its pride, rcasm for its religion, and exultation over its approaching downfall. This prophetic point of view is not ethical or religious, but na-nal. The Babylon of Ezekiel was not less proud, oppressive and olatrous than that of the second Isaiah. There is no indication at the policy of Nabunahid, who surrendered to Cyrus, was differ-t from that of Nebuchadrezzar who destroyed Jerusalem. The bylonian treatment of the Jewish exiles appears to have been mane and liberal throughout. But in the days of Ezekiel Israel's pe was in keeping quiet and maintaining friendly relations with bylon, and the prophet has no word to say against its moral and igious character; in the days of Cyrus the hope of Israel was in bylon's overthrow, and the prophets of the time freely denounce it ethical and religious grounds. They were single-minded in their votion to their people—they held up for them the standard of holi-sss of life as the condition of Yahwe's favor—nevertheless their judg-ent of foreign nations was determined by the political relation of ese to Israel.

6. Ezekiel, then, is definitely on the side of Babylon. He sees hope of present independence for Israel, and his utterances consist nost entirely of castigation of his people's sins, and elaboration of plan of national life for the restoration. It does not appear that his mpathy with Babylon brought him into disfavor with the people. ey were deaf, indeed, to his exhortations (xxxiii. 32), but the elders me to inquire of Yahwe through him (xx. 1), and he seems to have en uniformly treated with respect.

§ II. BABYLONIAN IDEAS.

1. Ezekiel's position would naturally bring him into contact with Babylonian ideas, and his friendly attitude towards the country would predispose him to accept them in so far as this was not inconsistent with his loyalty to his own people and religion. How far the books of the public libraries at Babylon and elsewhere would be accessible to him we have no means of knowing; but a residence of thirty years must have taught him much. It is to be regretted that he says so little of Babylonian customs and ideas; the reports of such an observer would have been of the highest value for us. As it is, we have only one or two general hints besides the history of the Garden of Eden.

2. The belomancy described in xxi. 26 f. (Eng. Vers. 21 f.) was a common practice in Babylon and elsewhere. It is referred to nowhere else in the Old Testament, but is natural in the mouth of Ezekiel who might have seen the ceremony performed, as we now have it figured on Assyrian and Babylonian monuments (see Lenormant, *La Divination*, ch. II.)

The first date of the beginning of Ezekiel's ministry (chap. i. 1) seems also to be reckoned from the era of Nabopalassar B. C. 625, from which to 594 would be about thirty years. The only other supposition that has any plausibility, namely, that the prophet gives the year of his own life, is rendered improbable by the phraseology, which is in the manner of reckoning from a chronological epoch; nowhere else is such a mode of giving a man's age found. This date (verse 1) seems to be from the prophet himself; the second date (verse 2), which gives the Jewish reckoning, is from the hand of an editor, who speaks of Ezekiel in the third person. It would appear, therefore, that Ezekiel had adopted the Babylonian mode of reckoning time, an indication that he had not held himself aloof from the life of the nation in whose midst his lot was cast.

3. Another apparent point of contact between Ezekiel and Babylon, I mean his use of Eden and the cherub, requires more careful consideration.

Let us first look at the occurrence of those words in the books of the Old Testament whose date can be fixed with some approach to exactness.

Outside of the Pentateuch Eden, as the name of the primeval paradise, is found only twice in other books than Ezekiel. Isa. li. 3 mentions it simply as the "garden of Yahwe," a type of fertility and gladness; I hold this passage to belong to about B. C. 540. With this may be compared Gen. xiii. 10, where the plain of the Jordan is

nilarly compared to the "Garden of Yahwe"; in Gen. ii., iii., the me is the "garden of Eden," or simply the "garden." In Joel 3 this fuller phrase also occurs: the land is likened to the "gar- n of Eden." The prophecy of Joel seems to me to be post-exilian. is not my purpose here to go into a discussion of the date of Isa. –lxvi. and Joel. In regard to the latter I will only say that the erence to the temple as existing (i. 14) and to the people as being rtly in captivity (iv. 1, 2), the mention of Tyre and Sidon and ilistia as principal enemies of Israel (iv. 4-6) together with Edom d Egypt, the silence respecting a King of Judah, and the general igious phraseology appears to me to point to a time not long after e building of the second temple. If this view is correct, reference Eden outside of the Pentateuch does not occur before Ezekiel. If el be put just before the exile or even in the beginning of the eighth ntury B. C., there is still nothing more than a bare mention of len except in Ezekiel and the Pentateuch.

A similar remark may be made of the cherub. Leaving out the neral reference in the post-exilian psalm civ. 3, 4, we find outside Ezekiel and the Pentateuch only Ps. xviii. 11, where the cherub is personification of the thunder-cloud or a symbolical creature, its m not described, which somehow stands in connection with this enomenon. There is the related conception of the seraph in Isa. Both of these appear to belong to the popular idea of the Israelites, d may date from the beginning of their history.

When we turn to Ezekiel we find the pictures of Eden and the erub drawn with remarkable fulness of detail. First his references Eden: "Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious ne was thy covering . . . the workmanship of thy tabrets d of thy pipes (or, jewel-settings) was prepared for thee in the day at thou wast created . . . thou wast perfect in thy ways from e day that thou wast created till iniquity was found in thee" (xxviii. , 15) "The cedars in the Garden of God could not hide him; the presses were not like his boughs, and the plane-trees were not like s branches" (xxxi. 8). The resemblance of this picture to that in enesis and its greater elaborateness in certain respects lie on the rface. And Ezekiel recurs to it again and again. The great prom- ence that he gives to it and the fulness of detail into which he enters dicate special interest in the story on his part and special sources of formation. Where could he have got the information except from abylonia? And, remembering the silence of all Old Testament iters before him on these points, does it not become probable that is now for the first time that the Eden history takes shape among

the Israelites, and that it was incorporated into the prepatriarcha narrative after the exile?

Ezekiel has three different representations of the cherub: 1. xxviii 14, which seems to be derived from the figure in Solomon's temple— the epithet "covering" being suggested by the fact that the cherubim "covered" the mercy-seat with their wings (1 K. viii. 7; Ex. xxv. 20); the "anointed" either referring solely to the king, or a genera epithet of the cherub as a part of the sanctuary which was consecrated by anointing (Ex. xl. 9)—the "holy mountain of God" may be the temple-hill, or it may be specially a designation of the altar with its burning coals or "stones of fire" (cp. Isa. vi. 6); in xlii. 15 the altar is called "mountain of God" (הראל) and "hearth of God" (אראל or אריאל) as being the center and essence of the sacrificial service; in the midst of this hearth the cherub is said to walk as the representative of God himself or of his ideally perfect creature and minister. It does not appear what the form of this cherub was except that it was winged, and the Babylonian monuments present nothing similar to it. I pass it by, therefore, with the single remark that, as a Phenician was the designer of Solomon's temple, it is not likely that its cherub-figure came from Egypt, it was more probably Babylonian in its origin, though we are unable to give proofs of such an origin, and that, as to the cherub of Exodus in the Tabernacle, our opinion of its form will depend on our view of the date and historical value of the descriptions of that book. 2. In Ezekiel's opening vision the cherub-face is identified in one place (x. 14) with that of the ox, though in the same connection the name cherub is given to the complex living creature with its four faces of ox, man, lion and eagle (ver. 1, 3, &c.)—the feet were those of a calf, but the general appearance was human. 3. In the description of the temple (xli. 18, 19) the cherub carved on the walls had only two faces, lion and human, and this is all that is said of it. It may be assumed that these last two forms were of Babylonian origin; Lenormant gives satisfactory proof of this in his "Origines de l'histoire," ch. iii. It is not necessarily true that the cherub-forms were bodily copies of Babylonian figures—the prophet may have got from these only the suggestion of composite creatures, and fashioned his material to suit the symbolism he had in mind. But the whole conception of this symbolism seems to be Babylonian in form, though the lofty moral and religious ideas attached to it by the prophet are the product of Israelitish thought.

4. One other point may be suggested—whether Ezekiel got a hint or impulse towards a more completely organized religious cultus and ritual from the Babylonians. There is extant no codification of the

estly ritual before the exile—we are left to gather its details from rare and brief statements of the historical books and the psalms. hile in the book of Deuteronomy we have the Tora as it was conved by the prophets in the early part of Josiah's reign or perhaps a f-century before, and in Leviticus the fully developed priestly ritual the time of Ezra and Nehemiah and later, we find only in Ezekiel formal statement of temple-ritual in the times preceding Ezra's t to Jerusalem from Babylon. That there was such a ritual we y take it for granted, and we may be equally sure that Ezekiel's tch was not inferior in fulness of elaboration to what existed before n. What led him to draw up this complete scheme of templevice, found in chs. xliii.–xlvi. of his book? Jeremiah, in whom, wever, the priest seems to have been sunk in the prophet, thought nothing of this sort. Hilkiah, who was high-priest under Josiah en the book of the Tora was found in the temple, attempted no lification—this was left to the priest-prophet of the Babylonian le.

Now there was undoubtedly a good deal in the circumstances of time to force on Ezekiel's attention the necessity of some such id ritual scheme of national life as he gives in the last chapters of book. The nation seemed to him going to pieces politically, and rally and religiously; the main reason of this was their faithlessness their God, their neglect of his worship, and this worship would be ured by a strict temple-law. The restored nation must be guided a more definite rule of service than had hitherto existed.

This is true. Yet it is worth while to ask whether the idea of preting this better defined scheme was not fostered and brought to turity by the ecclesiastical system of the people among whom he s living. We have already seen reason to believe that he was in newhat close contact with them, that he had opportunity of know- their customs, that he possibly admired and honored this nation ose dread king was so potent an instrument in the hands of the d of Israel for carrying out his designs. The Jews were never in se early times, as they have never since been, averse to getting ggestions from their neighbors. In Ezekiel's time the Babylonian tus was not only elaborate, but was recorded in books. The merous and splendid ceremonies, the offerings, the interpretation omens, the celebration of feast-days of deities required the connt care of a host of priests, who were supported by the gifts of the rshipers and from the property attached to the temples. It was a igious organization far in advance of that which existed in Israel, d it would not be strange if acquaintance with so well arranged a

system suggested to the prophet the desirability of something like i for his own people.

There are not data for a detailed comparison between Ezekiel' scheme and the Babylonian temple-organization, nor is it likely tha he took from the latter much more than the general idea. Th materials were already at hand in existing customs, which he ha merely to develop and systematize. The provision that would mos naturally suggest a borrowing is the assignment of land near th temple to the priests—an arrangement that then existed in Babylon but seems not to have existed in Israel up to that time.

So far as appears, the movement for a stricter ritual, which cul minated in Ezra's visit to Jerusalem, originated with Ezekiel. It influence on the succeeding history of the Jews is familiar—it gath ered up the formal elements of the nation's religious life into a mass and carried it on to the point that called for the prophetic protest o John the Baptist, and the completion of Israel's spiritual develop ment in Jesus Christ.

It is hardly necessary to remark that such a borrowing as this in n wise detracts from the true religious originality of Israel. The natio cast the materials thus gained from other peoples into the crucible o its own thought, and thence produced ideas, whose superiority to thos of the Babylonians is demonstrated by the history of the world. T trace the genesis of Jewish religious forms and ideas is to follow th guidance of God by which the Jews became the religious teachers o the world and prepared the way for Jesus of Nazareth. Whatever th seed, and whatever the soil into which it was cast, the fruit was n less the creation of the Divine maker of all things, in whose hand all the experiences of Israel were fashioned into a form destined t be one of the great educating influences of the race.

On the Use of לֵב and *Καρδία* in the Old and New Testaments.

BY PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D. D., LL. D.

The word לֵב, with its cognates, לֵבָב, &c , designates *the heart*, in the first place, of course, as the physical organ, the centre of *life;* and one is tempted to suspect some genetical relation to the German Leben and our English word "life." Then, it stands for the central part in general, the inside, and so for *the interior man* as manifesting himself in all his various activities, in his desires, affections, emotions, passions, purposes, his thoughts, perceptions, imaginations, his wisdom, knowledge, skill, his beliefs and his reasonings, his memory and his consciousness. It is not especially confined to the feelings and moral acts in distinction from the intellectual, except as there is more frequent occasion for its use in the former application than in the latter. It designates the central basis for the functions of the whole inner man.

These words, לֵב, לֵבָב, &c., are more frequently translated "mind" in our received version of the Old Testament than any other word, including such cases as "dead man out of mind," "bring to mind," "remember or come to mind," "this I recall to mind," &c. For this purpose, נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ come next in frequency.

1. Under לֵב are included such expressions as "imagination of the thoughts of his heart," "imagination of man's heart," Gen. vi. 5; viii. 21; also in Zechariah and in Jeremiah many times; "said in his heart," Gen. xvii. 17; "speaking in my heart," xxiv. 45; "wise-hearted," *i. e.* skilful, Exod. xxxi. 6; "wisdom of heart," xxxv. 35; "in whose heart the Lord hath put wisdom," *i. e.* skill, xxxvi. 2;

"an heart to perceive," Deut. xxix. 4 ; "in the imagination of min heart," xxix. 19 ; "told all his heart," *i. e.* all he knew, Jud. xvi. 17 "an understanding heart," לֵב שֹׁמֵעַ, 1 Kings iii. 9 ; "I have give thee a wise heart," iii. 12 ; "feignest them out of thine own heart, Neh. vi. 8; "meditation of my heart, "Ps. xix. 14; xlix. 3; "thought of his heart," xxxiii. 11 ; "heart inditing a good matter," xlv. 1 "write on the table of thine heart," Prov. iii. 3 ; "thine heart retai my words," iv. 4 ; "heart seeketh knowledge," xv. 14 ; "a man' heart deviseth his way," xvi. 9; "my heart had great experience of wis dom," Eccles. i. 16 ; "a wise man's heart discerneth both time, &c., viii. 5 ; "consider in his heart," Isa. xliv. 19.

לֵבָב is used in such cases as "consider in thine heart," Deut. iv 39 ; "thought in thy heart," xv. 9 ; "ye know in all your hearts, Josh. xxiii. 14 ; "understand with their heart," Isa. vi. 10 ; "hear of the rash shall understand," xxxii. 4 ; "thoughts of thy heart, Dan. ii. 30 ; "beast's heart given," iv. 16 : v. 21 : and vii. 4 "shut their hearts (fem. pl.) that they cannot understand," Isa xliv. 18.

נֶפֶשׁ is used for the affections quite as familiarly as לֵבָב, and, in tha sense, is translated sometimes "heart," but generally "soul."

If it be said, as to the connection of לֵב with wisdom, that, in th Proverbs and elsewhere, wisdom is a moral quality, and so לֵב in th sense of the affections is appropriately used with it ; let it be observe that בִּין, בִּינָה, and תְּבוּנָה are also used in connection with this wis dom, and that in the most striking cases, as (בִּין,) "O ye simple understand wisdom," Prov. viii. 5 ; (בִּינָה,) "Get understanding, "with all thy getting, get understanding," iv. 5 and iv. 7 ; "counse is mine, I am understanding," viii. 14 ; "the knowledge of the hol is understanding," ix. 10 ; (תְּבוּנָה) "bow thine ear to my under standing," v. 1 ; "and understanding put forth her voice," viii. 1 "a man of understanding hath wisdom," (note that it is not th converse), x. 23 ; "a man of understanding walketh uprightly," xv 21 ; "is of an excellent spirit," xvii. 27. So Isa. xi. 2, "the spiri of wisdom and understanding" (בִּינָה) ; and "ye fools, be of a understanding heart," (בִּין), Prov. viii. 5.

Καρδία.

The use of *Καρδία* in the New Testament corresponds almost perctly to that of לֵב in the Old Testament. It stands for the *mind*, e inner man, Lat. animus:—thus, "Think evil in your hearts," att. ix. 4; "should understand with their heart," xiii. 15; "out the heart proceed evil thoughts," xv. 19; "reasoning in their arts," Mark ii. 6; "not doubt in his heart," xi. 23; "imagination their hearts," Luke i. 51; "pondered them in her heart," ii. 19; mused in their hearts," iii. 15; "slow of heart to believe," xxiv. ; "they considered not for their heart was hardened," Mark vi. ; "have ye your hearts hardened? . . . do ye not yet underand?" Mark viii. 17, because they did not apprehend about the aven of the Pharisees; so in Acts xix. 9, "divers were hardened d believed not;" "therefore," says St. John, "they could not lieve because that Esaias said again, he hath blinded their eyes and rdened their heart, lest they should . . . understand with eir heart"; and so for other cases of hardening the heart;—to blind the mind" and "harden the heart," seem to be parallel exessions for the same thing;—again, "why hast thou conceived this ing in thine heart?" Acts v. 4; "show the work of the law in their arts, . . . their thoughts accusing or excusing," Rom. ii. 15; shalt believe in thine heart," x. 9; "neither have entered into the art of man the things," 1 Cor. ii. 9; "written in our hearts," iii. ; "I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I ite them," Heb. x. 16; "till the day-star arise in your hearts," 2 t. ii. 19.

With *καρδία* are connected *διαλογίσμοι*, "out of the heart proceed oughts," Matt. xv. 19; Mark vii. 21; "thoughts of many hearts," uke ii. 35; "Jesus perceived the thoughts of their hearts," ix. 47; why do thoughts arise in your hearts," xxiv. 38,—also *ἐνθυμήσεις*, discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart," Heb. iv. 12; *θυμέομαι*, "wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?" Matt. ix. 4;—so *ἐπίνοια*, "if perhaps the thought of thine heart," Acts viii. 22, d "hast thought," *νομίζω*, viii. 20;—also *διάνοια*, "imagination of eir hearts," Luke i. 51. *Διάνοια* is also used in the moral sense e *Καρδία*, "desires of the flesh and the mind," Eph. ii. 3; "enemies in your mind by wicked works," Col. i. 21; "I will put my ws into their mind," Heb. viii. 10; "I will put my laws into their arts, and in their minds will I write them," Heb. x. 16; "gird up e loins of your mind, be sober," 1 Pet. i. 13; "Stir up your pure

minds," 2 Pet. iii. 1;—also ἔννοια, "arm yourselves likewise with th same mind," 1 Pet. iv. 1;—also νόημα, "their minds were blinde . . . for the veil is upon their heart," 2 Cor. iii. 14; "hat blinded the mind of them that believe not," 2 Cor. iv. 4; "so you minds should be corrupted," xi. 3; "shall keep your hearts an minds," Phil. iv. 7;—also νοῦς, "God gave them over to a reproba mind," Rom. i. 28; "warring against the law of my mind," vii. 2 "with the mind I myself serve the law of God," vii. 25; "trans formed by the renewing of your mind," xii. 2; "renewed in the spir of your mind," Eph. iv. 23; "disputings of men of corrupt minds, 1 Tim. vi. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 8;—also φρόνημα and φρονέω, as φρόνημ σαρκός, Rom. viii. 7; and φρόνημα πνεῦματος, viii. 27; φρονέω τοῦτ Phil. ii. 5; "savourest not the things that be of God," Matt. xvi. 2 and Mark viii. 33; "do mind the things of the flesh," Rom. viii. 5 —also ψυχή, "minds evil-affected," Acts xiv. 2;—also, finally, an most striking of all, μετανοέω, and μετάνοια are the words used pre cisely for what we should call "a change of heart,"—not μεταχαρδ but μετάνοια.

Thus לֵב and καρδία are the subject or seat, not only of the affec tions, but of thought, imagination, meditation, memory, perception reflection, knowledge, skill, belief, judgment, reasoning, conscious ness; and, on the other hand, other words which are admitted prop erly to refer to intellectual operations are familiarly used also for th affections and all the moral activities.

The word φρήν, pl. φρένες, standing for the reins or kidneys, or th diaphragm or caul, came to denote, after its physical sense, what w express by heart, as properly as did καρδία; but, like καρδία, it cam also to stand for the whole mind. It is used but twice in the Ne Testament, and then in the same verse (1 Cor. xiv. 20), and is ther translated "understanding." It is very curious that, while th ancients treated several of the internal physical organs as the seat o the mind, *e. g.*, not only the heart and kidneys or liver, but th breast, and even the stomach and bowels, they never hit upon th *brains* for that purpose;—except, perhaps, in Dan. iv. 13, "vision of my *head*";—although φρένες comes so provokingly near the Englis word in sound that we are almost tempted to seek for some myste rious etymological connection.

The Latin "cor" of the same root as the Greek καρδία, was some times, though unfrequently, used for the cogitative or cognitiv faculty. Through the French it has passed out into the special sens of *courage*. The English *heart*, of the same root as the Greek an

tin words, is used almost exclusively for the seat of the affections
d in direct contradistinction from the understanding. Hence,
th its distinct signification and contrasted associations, it fails to
rrespond as an exact equivalent to the looser Hebrew and Greek
ords; though we have one phrase left in which it has the sense of
ind or memory, viz., "to learn by heart." May we not well be-
re, therefore, lest, by basing our expositions and doctrinal teaching
on the special force of the English term, we really pervert the
ord of God, instead of inculcating high spiritual truth?

The ancients did not make the nice mental and linguistic analyses
modern thought. They used לֵב, καρδία, בִּינָה, νοῦς, &c., for the

ole inner man, now with special reference to one special faculty,
state, and now to another. But καρδιά, for example, is *never* in
e New Testament contradistinguished from or contrasted with νοῦς,
διάνοια, &c.; and, when put side by side with them, it is by paral-
ism rather than distinction. Thus, when it is said thou shalt love
e Lord thy God with all thy heart (καρδία) and with all thy soul
υχῇ) and with all thy mind (διάνοια), it is not meant that heart,
ul, mind, are distinct parts of man; each is the whole inner man,
d they are all put together to make the expression of totality the
onger; and sometimes, to strengthen it still further, understanding
ύνεσις) and strength (ἰσχύς) are added.

Standing as it does for the inner man, καρδία is never contrasted
th anything else within, but with what is without. Thus our
viour: Nothing from without entering into a man can defile him,
t from within, out of the heart, proceed evil thoughts, &c.—and
ese defile a man. We have no right to connect with καρδία the
arp distinctions with which we use the modern word *heart*. Shall
say, for example, that believing with the heart is a different thing
m believing with the mind? The apostle says: "if thou shalt
nfess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine
art that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."
ow here heart is not opposed to mind but to mouth, the inward to
e outward; and "in the heart" adds no more to the believing than
with the mouth" adds to the confessing. It is merely said that one
an internal act, and the other an external act. It is no extraordi-
ry kind of believing any more than it is an extraordinary kind of
nfession. It is believing a logical proposition—"that God hath
sed him from the dead." No doubt the apostle means a true,
nest, lively faith, and a true, honest confession; and this he would

equally mean, if "in the heart" and "with the mouth" were no
there. Man believeth to righteousness, and confession is made unt
salvation; he believeth with the inner man, and confesseth with th
outer man.

Journal, December, 1881.

On the use of ψυχή and πνεῦμα, and Connected Words in the Sacred Writings.

BY PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D. D., LL. D.

The words נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ in Hebrew, ψυχή and πνεῦμα in Greek, ima and spiritus in Latin, Seele and Geist in German, soul and ost or spirit in English, are all alike derived from roots meaning or some movement of air, as breathing, or a waving of the wind. classical Greek ψυχή came to stand for the mind, the inner man, e immortal part of man; and, what is remarkable, it came to have pecial reference to the departed spirits or shades; while נֶפֶשׁ, the rresponding Hebrew word, came to designate the dead body. he classical Greek never carried πνεῦμα beyond its physical sense, ough the later Greek began to use it for life or the living being.

In the following paper it will be understood that, for the sake of greater evity, whenever the English words soul and spirit are employed in erence to Old Testament passages, they correspond to the Hebrew rds נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ, and in connection with the New Testament ssages, to ψυχή and πνεῦμα, respectively; unless some other word is pressly given as the original term.

Spirit and soul are used interchangeably, or as parallel and equiva- nt expressions; each for the whole inner man, the whole man clusive of the body; and both having the same predicates.

Isa. xxvi. 9, "With my soul have I desired thee, yea with my

spirit within me will I seek thee"; lvii. 16, "The spirit should fa
before me, and the souls which I have made"; Luke i. 46, "M
soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God m
Saviour"; Phil. i. 27, "Stand fast in one spirit, with one soul strivin
together"; Luke x. 21, "Rejoiced in spirit"; John xi. 33, "Groane
in spirit"; xiii. 21, "Troubled in spirit"; Mark viii. 12, "Sighe
deeply in his spirit"; Acts xvii. 16, "Spirit stirred within him"; xvii
5, "Pressed in spirit";—John xii. 27, "My soul is troubled"; 2 Pe
ii. 8, "Vexed his righteous soul"; Matt. xi. 29, "Ye shall find re
unto your souls"; xxvi. 38, and Mark xiv. 34, "My soul is exceed
ing sorrowful"; Luke ii. 35, "A sword shall pierce through thin
own soul"; Gen. xlii. 21, "We saw the anguish of his soul"; Le
xv. 29, 31, "Shall afflict your souls"; 1 Sam. i. 10, "She was i
bitterness of soul", (also Job iii. 10); Jud. xvi. 16, "His soul wa
vexed", also Ps. vi. 3, &c.;—Gen. xli. 8, "Spirit troubled"; Ex. v
9, "anguish of spirit"; Job. vii. 11, "I will speak in the anguish
my spirit"; see also "a broken spirit", "a wounded spirit", "vexa
tion of spirit", &c.

Thus the same affections are ascribed indiscriminately to the sou
and to the spirit; and one stands for the man himself as much as th
other.

The soul and the body are represented as constituting the whol
man. Matt. x. 28, "And fear not them which kill the body, bu
are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able t
destroy both soul and body in Gehenna"; see also Luke xii. 5. Her
"soul" is more than "the life"; for *that* man can destroy; it is th
living being;—and Gehenna is more than the grave or the valley o
Hinnom; for, according to St. Luke, man cannot cast into it. Here
too, it is plain the soul and the body are all there is of man. Mica
vi. 7, "Fruit of my body for the sin of my soul"; Isa. x. 18, "Bot
soul and body"; Gen. xxxv. 18, "Her soul was in departing";
Kings xix. 21, 22, "Let this child's soul come into him again."

Still more frequently are the spirit and body, in immediate con
trast, thus represented:—Luke viii. 55, "Her spirit came again an
she arose"; so, "into thy hands I commend my spirit"; "receive m
spirit"; 1 Cor. vi. 20, "Glorify God in your body and in your spirit"
vii. 34, "Holy both in body and in spirit"; Eph. iv. 4, "One body
one spirit"; James ii. 26, "As the body without the spirit is dead,
(where the spirit is recognized as the animating principle for th
body); so Rev. xi. 11, "The spirit of life from God entered into
them."

Our Lord himself contrasts spirit with flesh, σάρξ; never with ody, σῶμα. "That which is born of the flesh," says he, "is flesh; nd that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Here flesh does not ıean the body, but the whole natural man, that which is the product r the result of natural generation; while the spirit does not denote hat was in the man before as a constituent part of him, but ıat which is produced in him by the regenerating agency of the)ivine Spirit. St. Paul uses flesh and spirit in the same way. "The esh lusteth against the spirit," says he, "and the spirit against the esh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot o the things that ye would", (Gal. v. 17); and again, "So then hey that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the esh but in the spirit." Whence it is manifest that flesh is not ynonymous with body, for they were in the body.

When, on another occasion, our Lord says, "the spirit indeed is illing but the flesh is weak", the flesh may mean much the same as ody; but if so, the spirit means the same as soul or heart or mind; nd thus the distinction is equivalent to that between soul and body.

There are a few other passages where spirit and flesh are brought ıto contrast or juxtaposition,—particularly Heb. xii. 9, 10: "Furhermore, the fathers of our flesh we had as chasteners, and we revrenced them; shall we not much rather submit ourselves unto the 'ather of the [our?] spirits and live?" This has been variously ıterpreted; and it has been cited as proving the doctrine of creationsm, *i. e.*, that each human soul is created for each human body by an ct of God. But this seems to ignore the fact that God is the maker f our bodies as well as of our spirits or souls; see Ps. cxxxix. 13-16. 'he allusion may be to the original Divine inbreathing whereby 'man became a living soul"; or to the regenerating energy of the)ivine Spirit. The *soul* is also spoken of much in the same way in sa. lvii. 16: "The spirit should fail before me, and the souls which have made." For other passages similar to that in Hebrews, see Jumb. xvi. 22: "O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh"; xvii. 1, "The Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh"; Job. xii. o, "In whose hand is the soul (נֶפֶשׁ) of all life, and the breath רוּחַ) of all human flesh"; xxvii. 3, "The Spirit of God is in my ostrils"; xxxiii. 4, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the reath (נִשְׁמַת) of the Almighty hath given me life." In these pas-

ıges the Spirit seems to stand for the breath or the animating prinıple in man; and God is simply represented as the author and

preserver of our lives, with special reference, it may be, to our minds.

Spirit and heart, soul and heart, are also used interchangeably and by way of parallelism:—Isa. li. 15, "To revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones"; Deut. ii. 30, "God hardened his spirit and made his heart," &c.; Ps. li. 10, "Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me"; li. 17, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart," &c.; Ezek. xviii. 21, "A new heart and a new spirit"; —as for heart and soul, see Matt. xxii. 37, "With all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind"; see also Mark xii. 30, and Luke xii. 19; Acts iv. 32, "Of one heart and of one soul"; Deut. iv. 29, "If thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul"; see also vi. 5; x. 12; xi. 13; xiii. 3; xxvi. 16, "Keep and do them with all thine heart and with all thy soul"; xxx. 2, "Obey with all thy heart and with all thy soul"; Joshua xxii. 5, "Serve him with all your heart and with all your soul"; xxiii. 14, "Ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls"; 2 Kings xxiii. 3, 25, "To keep his commandments with all their heart and with all their soul"; 1 Chron. xxii. 19, "Set your heart and your soul to seek the Lord"; Eph. vi. 5, 6, "In singleness of your heart, . . . doing the will of God from the soul"; and so, Col. iii. 22, 23, "In singleness of heart, fearing God; and whatsoever ye do, do it from the soul."

Spirit and mind are both contrasted and conjoined. In 1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15, spirit and νοῦς are contrasted: "My spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the understanding also." In Eph. iv. 23, they are conjoined or merged: "Renewed in the spirit of your mind, νοῦς." In 1 Cor. ii. 11, "The spirit of man in him" stands for his conscious being, it *knows* the things of the man.

Sin, perversion, pollution, are predicated alike of the soul, the spirit, the heart, and the mind. Lev. iv. 2, "If a soul sin;" see also, vi. 2, etc.; xvii. 11, "Make an atonement for your souls" (here soul may mean merely the person); Hab. ii. 4, "His soul is not upright in him"; Ezek. xviii. 4, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die"; xxxvi. 5, "With despiteful minds (souls)"; Micah. vi. 7, "The fruit of my body for the sin of my soul"; Acts xv. 24, "Subverting your souls"; 1 Pet. i. 22, "Ye have purified your souls"; 2 Pet. ii. 14, "Beguiling unstable souls"; Deut. ii. 10, "God hardened his spirit"; Judges ix. 23; 1 Sam. xvi. 14, 15, &c., "An evil spirit"; 1 Kings xxii. 21, 22, &c., "A lying spirit"; Ezek. xviii. 21, "A new heart and a new spirit"; see in Gospels, "Unclean spirits"; 2 Cor. vii. 1, "Filthiness of the flesh and spirit"; James iv. 5,

The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy";—for "heart" no tations are needed;—for "mind," Eph. ii. 3, "desires of the flesh f the mind (διανοία)"; Col. i. 21, "Enemies in mind (διανοία) by icked works; 2 Cor. xi. 3, "So your minds (νοήματα) should be orrupted"; Rom. i. 28, "Reprobate mind (νοῦς)"; Col. ii. 18, 'Puffed up by his fleshly mind (νοῦς)"; 1 Tim. vi. 5, "Corrupt inds (νοῦς)"; Tit. i. 15, "Mind (νοῦς) and conscience is defiled"; om. viii. 7, "The mind of the flesh (φρόνημα σαρκός) is enmity gainst God."

Righteousness and purity are similarly predicated, but no texts are eeded in proof.

Life after death, future punishment and salvation, are predicated like of the soul and of the spirit.

Job xxxii. 22, "His soul dwelleth near unto Sheol"; Ps. xvi. 10, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol"; xxx. 3, "Brought up my oul from Sheol"; Matt. x. 28, "Destroy both soul and body in Gehenna"; John xii. 25, "He that hateth his life (ψυχή) in this vorld shall keep it unto life (ζωή) eternal"; Matt. x. 39, "He that ndeth his life (ψυχή) shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my ake shall find it"; also, xvi. 25, 27; Mark viii. 35, 38,—"Whoso- ver shall lose his life (ψυχή) for my sake and the Gospel's, the same hall save it," &c.; also, Luke ix. 24, 27; 2 Cor. xii. 15, "I will ost gladly spend and be spent for your souls"; Heb. vi. 19, "An nchor of the soul"; 1 Peter ii. 11, 25, "Fleshly lusts, which war gainst the soul"; "The shepherd and bishop of your souls"; Heb. . 39, "Saving of the soul"; James i. 21, "Able to save your ouls"; 1 Pet. i. 9, "Salvation of your souls"; iv. 19, "Commit he keeping of your souls to him"; Rom. ii. 7, 9, "To those who eek immortality, eternal life, but tribulation and anguish upon very soul of man that doeth evil"; Rev. vi. 9, "I saw under the ltar the souls," &c.; xx. 4, "I saw the souls of them which were eheaded," &c.;—Ps. xxxi. 5, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit"; ee also Luke xxiii. 46; Eccles. iii. 21, the spirit of man that goeth pward"; xii. 7, "The spirit shall return unto God who gave it"; Cor. v. 5, "That the spirit may be saved"; Heb. xii. 23, "Spirits f just men made perfect"; 1 Pet. iii. 19, "The spirits in prison."

Both נֶפֶשׁ and ψυχή are sometimes, but particularly ψυχή, used in sort of wavering sense between what we express by "life" and what e express by "soul," or as combining both senses. See the already uoted passages, John xii. 25; Matt. x. 39; xvi. 26, &c.; Mark viii. 5–37; and Luke ix. 24, 25.

Sometimes נֶפֶשׁ is used of the life of *brutes*. Gen. i. 21, 24, "Every living creature that moveth," "The living creature after his kind"; ii. 19, "Every living creature"; ix. 4, "Flesh with the life thereof . . . shall ye not eat"; iv. 12, 15, 16, "Every living creature"; Lev. xxiv. 18, "Flesh with the life thereof"; also, xvii. 11, 14, and Deut. xii. 23; Numb. xxxi. 28, "One soul of five hundred both of the persons and of the beeves"; Job xii. 10, "The soul of every living thing, and the spirit (רוּחַ) of all mankind."

These fourteen are all the cases that I can find in the Old Testament in which the Hebrew word has this application. In the New Testament there are but two cases of ψυχή so used; Rev. viii. 9, "All which were in the sea and had life died"; and xvi. 3, "And every living soul died in the sea."

On the other hand, רוּחַ is used of *beasts* six times; Gen. vi. 17, "All flesh wherein is the breath of life"; so also, vii. 15, 22; Ps. civ. 29, "Thou takest away their breath (רוּחַ)"; Eccles. iii. 19, "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts . . . yea they have all one breath (רוּחַ)"; 21, "The spirit of the beast that goeth downward."

And נֶפֶשׁ is used of God in the Old Testament nine times; Jud. xvi. 16, "His soul was grieved for the misery of the children of Israel": Isa. i. 14, "My soul hateth"; xiii. 2, "In whom my soul delighteth"; Jerem. v. 9 and ix. 9, "Shall not my soul be avenged?" xii. 7, "The dearly beloved of my soul"; xiv. 19, "Hath thy soul loathed Zion?" xxxii. 41, "With my whole heart and with my whole soul"; Lev. xxvi. 11, "My soul shall not abhor you." In the New Testament ψυχή is so applied twice; Matt. xii. 18, "In whom my soul is well pleased;" and Heb. x. 38, "My soul shall have no pleasure in him":—both cited from the Septuagint.

In general נֶפֶשׁ and ψυχή are distinguished from חַי and ζωή. The latter stand for life, living, in the *abstract*, (though חַי is also frequently used concretely, both as an adjective and for ζῶον). But the former are always *concrete*, and stand for somewhat that lives, either the vital principle itself or the living being; and so they come to represent the person, the soul, the self; which חַי and ζωή never do. This is the strongest evidence that they stand for the whole inner man; for the

ntre of the consciousness of our inner being. Life (חַי) and soul נֶפֶשׁ) are contradistinguished: Job x, 1, "My soul is weary of my

e"; Ps. lxvi. 9, "Which holdeth our soul in life"; Prov. iii. , "So shall they be life unto thy soul"; see also John xii. 25, . For ζωή see also 1 Pet. iii. 10, "He that will love life,"—this very different from loving his life, ψυχή; Jas. iv. 14, "What is ur life? it is even a vapour"; 1 Tim. iv. 8, "Having promise of e life that now is and of that which is to come"; 1 Cor. xv. 18, If in this life only," &c. Of ψυχή such propositions are never ade.

But as נֶפֶשׁ and ψυχή stand thus for the vital or animating prin-

ple, so also do רוּחַ and πνεῦμα; as, "all flesh wherein is the breath

f life," (Gen. v. 17; vii. 15, 22; &c.); "Her spirit came again and e arose," (Luke viii. 55); "As the body without the spirit is dead," Jas. ii. 26.)

As the soul is the seat of the affections, so also, as we have seen, is e spirit. On the other hand, as the spirit is used for the rational ind, which is conscious of the things of man that are in him; so, lso the soul *knows, thinks, remembers*: Psalms cxxxix. 14, "my soul noweth right well"; Prov. xix. 2, "That the soul be without knowledge not good"; 1 Sam. xx 4, "What thy soul speaketh"; Lam. iii. 20, My soul hath them still in remembrance"; Josh. xxiii. 14, "Ye now in all your hearts, and in all your souls," &c.

As soul stands familiarly for the person, the self, the ego, so that my soul," "thy soul," "his soul," often mean—though always robably with a certain peculiar modification of sense—the same as *thou, he*;—so also is the spirit used. Thus, Isa. xxxviii. 16, "In ll these things is the life of my spirit; so wilt thou recover me and ake me live"; "where "Life of my spirit" is *my life*; "My spirit" myself, just as "My soul" is I. So also, "Hath refreshed my pirit and yours," (1 Cor. xvi. 18, also 2 Cor. vii. 13), *i. e.*, me and ou. And thus, when, to the salutation: "The Lord be with you," is answered, "And with thy spirit,"—"Thy spirit" means simply *ee.*

In Job xxxii. 8, it seems to be implied that the spirit, רוּחַ, belongs man naturally; and the natural understanding is said to come into , as it were, from the Spirit of God: "But there is a spirit in man, nd the inspiration (נִשְׁמַת) of the Almighty giveth him understanding.

That what is called πνεῦμα is *naturally* in man as well as what is alled ψυχή is further evident from the words of St. Paul, which occur

in immediate connexion with his contrast of the natural or psychical with the spiritual or pneumatical man: "For who of men," says he, "Knoweth the things of man (or of the man, or man in general) save the spirit of man (or of the man) which is in him?" This spirit, then, belongs to man as man, to all men; and it is here regarded as the seat of human consciousness.

Thus then we have seen that:

(1) Spirit and soul are used indiscriminately for the whole inner man.

(2) The same predicates, the same affections, are ascribed to both.

(3) Soul and body, or spirit and body, stand alike for the whole man.

(4) Spirit and flesh have sometimes a special contrast, but not as being constituent parts of our natural constitution.

(5) Heart is used interchangeably with spirit or with soul.

(6) Spirit and mind are contrasted as well as conjoined.

(7) Sin, pollution, perversion, as well as righteousness and purity, are predicated alike of soul, spirit, heart and mind.

(8) Life after death, future punishment and salvation are predicated alike of the soul and of the spirit.

(9) Spirit and soul are both used for the principle of life, the animating principle in the body.

(10) Both terms are used for the life of beasts; and both are used in respect to God, in the New Testament as well as in the Old.

(11) Both are used to denote not only the seat of the affections, but the rational conscious mind and the proper personal self.

Let us turn now to some points of view in which the two terms or things are discriminated.

That נֶפֶשׁ and (in the Septuagint) ψυχή should come to stand for a *dead body*, is a remarkable and startling fact. But this is explained by considering that the body is regarded as having been alive; and that, to the eye, the body represents the *person*. Indeed, in our ordinary English, we have remarkable traces of a converse usage, viz., of "body" for person; as anybody, everybody, somebody, nobody, busybody, &c.,—terms which we never apply to the lower animals, and which mean, therefore, not individual bodies, but proper persons. Besides we may note the tendency in the vulgar thought and speech in general to degrade *person* to *body*, as in the phrases, "He has a fine person", "To adorn the person", "His personal appearance or bearing", &c. And thus there is danger that that most refined and elevated philosophical conception of personality should be by many people

ıtirely missed, or merged in mere corporeity. It may be added ıat, in imitation of Scripture language, we also, in current English, se *soul* for *person* numerically, as "Every soul on board", "more ıan twenty souls", &c. In neither of the above mentioned ways is ɔirit ever used.

On the other hand, the special uses of spirit are:

(1) To indicate the Spirit of God, the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit.

(2) In the Acts of the Apostles frequently, and sometimes elsehere, to indicate his miraculous gifts, or with special reference to ıem; but, in Cor. xii. 4-11, these are emphatically distinguished in ıeir diversity from the one giver. In 1 Cor. xiv. 12, spiritual gifts re called *πνεύματα* (in the plural).

(3) To denote devils or demons, "evil or foul spirits"; and good ngels, "ministering spirits."

(4) To denote temper, disposition, character; as, "Ye know not hat manner of spirit ye are of", (Luke ix. 55); "A meek and uiet spirit", (1 Pet. iii. 4); so "a spirit of meekness", "of love", c.; and "spirit of your mind."

In none of these senses is soul ever used.

The question now arises, is man's nature in the Scripture regarded s bipartite or tripartite?

In the first place, the discriminations just mentioned in the Scripıre usage of the terms soul and spirit, when compared with the great ıass of indiscriminate usage, can hardly be urged as a sufficient round for regarding soul and spirit as distinct hypostases, as contraistinguished constituent parts, of man's natural constitution.

In the second place, by our Lord and by the Evangelists, only a wo-fold division is recognized;—it is either "soul and body" or 'spirit and body." "Soul and spirit" are never discriminated. In ne case only the two are placed in juxtaposition, and that in Mary's nagnificat; where they are in parallelism, and mean the same thing. Such also is the *general* usage of the New Testament writers, St. Paul ncluded. Our Lord never speaks of "body *and* spirit", but only of 'body *and* soul." He never speaks of the spirit but only of the oul, as *being saved.*

But there remain a few passages in the New Testament which are ɔy many held to teach the doctrine of trichotomy; and thereby, as hey think, to lay the foundation for a specifically Christian philosɔphy of human nature. This doctrine, with various modifications, vas maintained by several of the early fathers, and is by some urged ıs a solvent for almost all anthropological difficulties in theology. The passages relied upon are: 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12; Jude 19;

Jas. iii. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 14, and xv. 44, 45. I believe these are al that are to any purpose as proofs. And now of these in order:—

(*a*) Take first the passage from 1 Thess. v. 23, "Your whol spirit and soul and body." Here I submit that, in Scripture style such an expression is not to be conceived of as setting forth or imply ing a philosophical analysis of man's constitution, but rather as rhetorical fulness of statement for the whole inner and outer man; jus as "Thou shalt love God with all thy heart, and with all thy *soul* and wit all thy mind," is not to be understood as (with the body) implying tetratomistic analysis of the constitution of man. And yet the mod of expression in this latter case is stronger for that purpose than i the former for a similar purpose; it points much more emphatically towards a real distinction and separation of parts than the simpl phrase, "With all thine heart and soul and mind" (like "whol spirit and soul and body") would have done. To these four (bod being included) is, in one case, added a fifth, "and with all th strength." Does this imply the philosophy of a pentatomistic consti tution of man's being? We have just seen that both the Hebre and the Greek terms for *soul* and *spirit* are used, both in the Old an New Testaments, as, in general, synonomous expressions for tha whole living being which, as Butler says, we call ourselves. It i true that, like all so-called synonomous words,—like heart and sou and mind,—they may each have some special modification of mean ing and some special proprieties of use and application. But all thi is not enough to show that they denote distinct things or beings o objects of thought. We must always beware how we read ou modern abstractions and nice metaphysical analyses into the concret and popular language of Scripture. The argument from ὁλόκληρο (whole) as implying three parts is merely fanciful.

(*b*) Next comes Heb. iv. 12, "The dividing asunder of soul an spirit." This dividing is thought to settle the question as to the rea distinction between soul and spirit, by showing that they are not onl logically but actually separable. But here, in fact, the whole opera tion is logical,—an operation by the word of God acting upon func tions, and not directly upon entities, and an operation which i described in highly figurative language. In any event, it does no express a dividing asunder of the soul *from* the spirit, but a dividin *of* the soul and a dividing *of* the spirit; for it is plain that the divid ing "of the joints and marrow" is not a dividing of the joints *fro* the marrow, but a separation of joint from joint or of each joint i twain, and a cleaving asunder of the marrow,—as if by a strong downward stroke of a sword, the whole spine were to be cleft in th

dst. It is plain, too, that the critical discerning or distinguishing of the thoughts and intents of the heart," is not a discriminating of ɔughts from intents but of thought from thought and intent from ent; still less can it reasonably be supposed to imply that thoughts d intents are assumed to be two real and substantial divisions or nstituent parts of the heart. If it be suggested that the soul and rit are absolute units, indivisible entities, and, so, incapable of ɔaration into parts; I answer, that neither the language of Scrip-re nor the ordinary speech of even these our philosophical and entific times has anything to do with such nice distinctions. The riptures speak, and we speak, of a distracted mind, a divided heart, wounded and broken spirit. In short, in my view, the text would ve much the same sense if it read: "Dividing asunder of heart and ul," &c., or, "Of heart and spirit," &c.

(c) Four passages remain; in all of which the adjective "psychic" "psychical," (*Ψυχικός*), is used in opposition to "spiritual" or pneumatic," (*πνευματικός*.) St. Jude speaks of certain men as psychical, not having the spirit." But surely he is not speaking men who are destitute of a trichotomistic part of the human nstitution; but of men who, in their full natural powers, are des-ute of the Spirit of God, and so are of a worldly and carnal disposi-ɔn. In like manner St. James describes certain men as "earthly, ychical, demon-like";—as if he had said, "not having the Spirit of ɔd, but the spirit of evil demons." So also St. Paul, in 1 Cor. ii. , represents the "psychical" man as one who is not enlightened d taught by the Spirit of God, in contrast with the spiritual (or ieumatical) man who is so taught. Thus St. Jude furnishes the key, psychical, not having the Spirit"—not having the Spirit of God.

The passage in 1 Cor. xv. 44 is somewhat different. Here the postle speaks of "a psychical *body* and a spiritual (or pneumatical) *dy*." Now, as the psychical man is not a man who is destitute of a ird part of man's normal constitution, or of a rational and moral ature, but a man who has not the Spirit of God; he is, while in this atural condition,—while not informed, illumined, energized by the dwelling of the Divine Spirit, worldly, carnal, sensual; and so he associated in the Apostle's mind with this mortal and corruptible ɔdy. And the spiritual (or pneumatic), which the Apostle most com-only sets in an antithesis to the fleshly or carnal (*σαρκικός—πνεῦμα σάρξ*)—is thus naturally opposed here to the psychical. The sychical body, then, is that which furnishes the organic connexion ith worldly and sensible things, while the spiritual body is that hich shall furnish an organic connexion with external things in a

heavenly and spiritual state;—I say, an organic connexion after th analogy of the present body in its relation to the mind or soul. F the spiritual body is *body* and not spirit, and therefore must con under the definition of *body*. If it were to be mere spirit, then eve man, in the future state, would have two spirits, the spirit that h had here and another spirit received at the resurrection.

The Spirit of God is not represented as coming into direct conta with the outer man, but first with the inner man, and through th with the outer. And thus the Apostle says: "If the Spirit him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raise up Christ Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodi by his spirit that dwelleth in you." And the operation of the Spi of God upon the inner man, renewing, enlightening, sanctifyin changing the psychical to the pneumatical man; is not represente and is not to be conceived of, as introducing into its subjects a new substance or faculties or constituent parts of their nature, b as renovating and restoring the deranged and perverted or mi directed functions; the regenerate man is renewed in the spirit a temper of his mind, renewed in righteousness and true holines renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created hi created anew in Christ Jesus. Through the power of the Ho Ghost, Christ dwells in his people as a quickening Spirit. It is pr sumed that man in his original condition, before he sinned, was n destitute of the Spirit. And yet, to illustrate the reality of th psychical body, the Apostle refers to Adam as he was originally cr ated: "And *so* it is written," he says, "the first man Adam w made a living soul." Thus, in his normal original state, he was psychical man. The *ψυχή*, *ψυχικός*, do not, therefore, necessari carry with them a bad sense; but only when the latter is used in distinctively negative way, as the Apostle here employs it, so that implies the destitution of the Divine Spirit.

But now, finally, supposing that the Apostle here or elsewhe would contradistinguish soul and spirit as being distinct and co-ord nate, higher and lower, parts of man's inner nature; I should sti maintain that the whole *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures requires us consider it as a *functional* and not a *substantial* distinction. The tw fold distinction into body and soul, body and spirit, body and min is to be regarded as a real and substantial distinction; but in th threefold distinction into "body, soul and spirit," that between so and spirit simply refers to different faculties, relations or activities— functions—of the inner man, who is substantially an individu unit, but whose functions are thus distributed in respect to his mor

d religious state, into two great departments, lower and higher, -thward and heavenward.

Those who scout the idea of substances as a mere metaphysical ment must of course admit the negative proposition, that the dis- ction in question is not substantial; and it is difficult to see how ey can refuse to admit the positive proposition, that it is functional. On the other hand, those who adopt the idea of substance, as it is mmonly understood, must either admit the statement that the dis- ction in question is not substantial but functional, or they must ld that there are real substances in the world which are neither atter nor mind, and that either the soul or the spirit is such a sub- nce.

I suppose that nobody has ever denied or doubted that in man's ner nature there are higher and lower powers or faculties or func- ns, and that it is the higher parts that are directly receptive of the pulse of the Divine Spirit. And if this is all that is meant by the chotomists, they need not make much noise about their discovery. ne real difficulty would be to draw any precise line between the gher and the lower, and to distribute all man's faculties or func- ns (other than the bodily) into the two departments of soul and irit; and especially to make this distribution *as of Scripture author-* and in consonance with the actual use of these words in the Old d New Testaments, or in either of them. The commonly received d very loose division of man's nature into Intellectual, Moral and ysical does not seem to correspond to what is meant by those who ake the threefold division into spirit, soul and body; for they are derstood to include the higher—rational as well as moral—facul- es under the spirit, while they admit that in great part the moral fections belong to the soul. But we have seen that the same affec- ns belong also to the spirit; and St. Paul enumerates among the uits of the spirit, "love, joy, peace," &c., and speaks of "your love the spirit." And if it be suggested that the higher affections long to the spirit and the lower to the soul, it is remarkable that e very highest of the affections, that which is the foremost of the iritual graces, the very heart of the highest spiritual life, that which ill endure when faith and knowledge shall vanish away—*love*, is a nction of the soul. See Isa. xlii. 1, "In whom my soul delight- h"; and Song of Solomon, i. 7 and iii. 1–4, where "my soul veth" is five times repeated. Here the Septuagist uses the verb *ἀγαπάω*.

The trichotomists are understood to admit that the will belongs to e soul; and certainly the soul is represented as the active, motive

power in man. But St. Paul "purposed in the spirit" (ἔθετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι). The conscience might be assigned to the spirit, but i includes a *sentiment* as well as a judgment; and, besides, the soul a the person, the ego,—as it is admitted to be,—must be the subjec of the whole consciousness.

The spirit, as we have seen, may be used for the person also; bu when the Divine Spirit is said to "witness with our spirits that w are the Sons of God," it does not appear that the sense is anywis different from what it would be if the apostle had said "with ou minds," "our hearts," or "our souls." For the same apostle say that "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts" (no into our spirits); and the Spirit thus imparted begets, or becomes, i us "the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father."

The general conclusion, therefore, is, that:

(1) The words soul and spirit are generally employed in the Scrip tures in an indiscriminate way, each as denoting the whole mind o inner man.

(2) In some few cases *spirit* may be used to denote especially th higher faculties or functions of the mind or soul, but even then no in direct contrast with the soul itself.

(3) In some other cases *spirit* is used for what does not at all belon to man in his natural state; but, for a certain temper, disposition an direction of the heart, imparted by the Divine Spirit in the life o Christ, by virtue of which Christians are called spiritual (or pneumat ical) men.

But (4) there is no ground in the Scripture use of the words sou and spirit to furnish the foundation for the trichotomistic doctrine o a sharp and radical distinction between the two, as co-ordinate part of man's nature,—much less as distinct substances in his constitution

NOTE.—In the second Scripture quotation, p. 74, from Isa. lvii. 1 the original word for "souls" is נְשָׁמוֹת

On the Construction of Romans ix. 5.

BY PROF. EZRA ABBOT, D. D., LL. D., CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

We shall understand better the passage to be discussed if we consider its relation to what precedes and follows, and the circumstances under which it was written.

In the first eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans the Apostle has set forth the need and the value of the gospel, as "the power of God unto salvation to *every one that believeth*; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." In view of the present blessings and the glorious hopes of the Christian believer he closes this part of the Epistle with an exultant song of triumph.

But the doctrine of Paul was in direct opposition to the strongest prejudices of the Jews, and their most cherished expectations. It placed them on a level as to the conditions of salvation with the despised and hated Gentiles. The true Messiah, the king of Israel, the spiritual king of men, had come; but the rulers of their nation had crucified the Lord of glory, and the great mass of the people had rejected him. They had thus placed themselves in direct opposition to God; they had become ἀνάθεμα ἀπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ, outcasts from the Messiah and his kingdom. Christians, a large majority of them Gentiles by birth, were now the true Israel. No rite of circumcision, no observance of the Jewish Law was required, as the condition of acceptance with God, and the enjoyment of the Messianic blessings; no sacrifice but self-sacrifice: the only condition was *faith*, as Paul uses the term,—a *practical* belief and trust in Christ, and thus in God revealed in his paternal character; a faith that carried with it the affections and will, πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.

How could these things be? How was this gospel of Paul to be reconciled with the promises of God to the "holy nation"? how with his justice, wisdom, and goodness? Had God cast off his people,

"Israel his servant, Jacob his chosen, the seed of Abraham his friend"? These are the great questions which the Apostle answers in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of this Epistle. The first five verses are to be regarded as a *conciliatory introduction* to his treatment of this subject, on which he had so much to say that was not only hard for the unbelieving Jews, but for Jewish Christians, to understand and accept.

The unbelieving Jews regarded the Apostle as an apostate from the true religion, and as an enemy of their race. Five times already he had received from them forty stripes save one; he had been "in perils from his own countrymen" at Damascus, at Antioch in Pisidia, at Iconium and Lystra, at Thessalonica, Berœa, and Corinth,—often in peril of his life. By a great part of the believing Jews he was regarded with distrust and aversion. (See Acts xxi. 20, 21.) His doctrines were indeed revolutionary. Though he was about to go to Jerusalem to carry a liberal contribution from the churches of Macedonia and Achaia to the poor Christians in that city, he expresses in this Epistle great anxiety about the reception he should meet with (anxiety fully justified by the result), and begs the prayers of the brethren at Rome in his behalf. (Rom. xv. 30–32.) As the Jews hated Paul, they naturally believed that he hated them.

These circumstances explain the exceedingly strong asseveration of his affection for his countrymen, and of his deep sorrow for their estrangement from God, with which this introduction begins. So far from being an enemy of his people, he could make any sacrifice to win them to Christ. They were his brethren, his kinsmen as to the flesh; he gloried in sharing with them the proud name of Israelite; he delights to enumerate the magnificent privileges by which God had distinguished them from all other nations,—"the adoption, and the glory, and the giving of the Law, the covenants, the temple-service, and the promises"; theirs were the fathers, and from among them, as the crowning distinction of all, the Messiah was born, the supreme gift of God's love and mercy not to the Jews alone, but to all mankind. All God's dealings with his chosen people were designed to prepare the way, and had prepared the way, for this grand consummation. How natural that when, in his rapid recital of their historic glories, the Apostle reaches this highest distinction of the Jews and greatest blessing of God's mercy to men, he should express his overflowing gratitude to God as the Ruler over All; that he should "thank God for his unspeakable gift"! I believe that he has done so; and that the fifth verse of the passage we are considering should be translated,—"whose are the fathers, and from whom is the Mes-

n as to the flesh: he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever. men.," or, "he who is God over all be blessed for ever. Amen." e doxology springs from the same feeling and the same view of the cious providence of God which prompted the fuller outburst at the l of the eleventh chapter, where, on completing the treatment of subject which he here introduces, the Apostle exclaims, "O the pth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How searchable are his judgments and untraceable his ways! . . . r from Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things: to m be (*or* is) the glory forever. Amen."

I believe that there are no objections to this construction of the sage which do not betray their weakness when critically examined; l that the objections against most of the other constructions which ve been proposed are fatal.

The passage is remarkable for the different ways in which it has en and may be punctuated, and for the consequent variety of con- uctions which have been given it. The Greek is as follows:

——καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

It *grammatically* admits of being punctuated and construed in at st seven different ways.

1. Placing a *comma* after *σάρκα*, and also after *θεός*, we may trans- e the last clause:—"who (*or* he who) is God over all, blessed for er."

2. Putting the second comma after *πάντων* instead of *θεός*:—"who he who) is over all, God blessed for ever."

3. With a comma after *πάντων* and also after *θεός*:—"who (*or* he o) is over all, God, blessed for ever." So Morus, Gess (*Christi rson und Werk*, II. i. 207 f., Basel, 1878).

4. Placing a comma after *ὁ ὤν*, and also after *θεός*:—"He who God over all, blessed for ever."—See Wordsworth's note, which wever is not consistent throughout; and observe the mistrans- ion at the end of his quotation from Athanasius (*Orat. cont. ianos*, i. § 24, p. 338).*

5. Placing a comma after *σάρκα*, and a *colon* after *πάντων*, the last rt of the verse may be rendered:—"and from whom is the Mes- h as to the flesh, who (*or* he who) is over all: God be blessed for er. Amen."

*Perhaps I ought to add here as a curiosity a construction proposed the *Record* newspaper, in an article copied in *Christian Opinion d Revisionist* for March 11, 1882, p. 222. The writer would trans- e: "Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, od. Blessed be He for ever! Amen."

6. Placing a *colon* after *σάρκα*, *θεός* may be taken as predicate thus:—"he who is over all is God, blessed for ever"; so Professo B. H. Kennedy, D. D., Canon of Ely; or thus:—"he who was ove all being (*literally*, was) God, blessed for ever." So Andrews Norton

7. With a colon after *σάρκα*, *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* may be taken a the subject, and *εὐλογητός* as predicate, with the ellipsis of *εἴη* o *ἔστιν*, making the last part of the verse a doxology, thus:—"he wh is over all, God, be blessed (*or* is to be praised) for ever"; or, "h who is God over all be blessed (*or* is to be praised) for ever"; o "God, who is over all, be blessed (*or* is to be praised) for ever."

I pass over other varieties of translation and interpretation, depend ing on the question whether *πάντων* is to be taken as masculine o neuter, and on the wider or narrower application of the word in eithe case.

In Nos. 1–4 inclusive, it will be seen that the *ὁ ὤν* with all tha follows, including the designation *θεός*, is referred to *ὁ χριστός*; i Nos. 6 and 7, *ὁ ὤν* introduces an independent sentence, and *θεό* denotes God, the Father. No. 5 refers the first part of the sentenc in debate to *ὁ χριστός*, the last part to God.

The question of chief interest is whether in this passage the Apostl has called Christ *God*. Among those who hold that he has done so the great majority adopt one or the other of the constructions num bered 1 and 2; and it is to these, and especially to No. 2, followe both in King James's version and the Revised Version (text), that shall give special attention. Among those who refer the last part o the sentence to God and not Christ, the great majority of scholar adopt either No. 5 or No. 7. I have already expressed my preferenc for the latter construction, and it is generally preferred by those wh find here a doxology to God.

I. We will first consider the objections that have been urged agains the construction which makes the last part of the sentence, beginning with *ὁ ὤν*, introduce a doxology to God. I shall then state the argu ments which seem to me to favor this construction, and at the sam time to render the constructions numbered 1 to 4 each and all unten able. Other views of the passage will be briefly noticed. Som remarks will be added on the history of its interpretation, though no full account of this will be attempted.

1. It is objected that a doxology here is wholly out of place; tha the Apostle is overwhelmed with grief at the Jewish rejection of th Messiah and its consequences, and "an elegy or funeral discours cannot be changed abruptly into a hymn."—He is indeed deeply

rieved at the unbelief and blindness of the great majority of his ountrymen; but his sorrow is not hopeless. He knows all the vhile that "the word of God hath not failed;" that "God hath not ast off his people whom he foreknew"; that at last "all Israel hall be saved"; and nothing seems to me more natural than the lay of mingled feelings which the passage presents; grief for the resent temporary alienation of his countrymen from Christ; joy and hanksgiving at the thought of the priceless blessings of which Christ vas the minister to man, and in which his countrymen should ultiiately share.

Flatt, Stuart, and others put the objection in a very pointed form. They represent a doxology as making Paul say, in effect: "The pecial privileges of the Jews have contributed greatly to enhance the guilt and punishment of the Jewish nation; God be thanked that he has given them such privileges!"—But they simply read into the passage what is not there. There is nothing in the context to suggest hat the Apostle is taking this view of the favor which God had shown he Jewish nation. He is not denouncing his countrymen for their guilt in rejecting the Messiah, and telling them that this guilt and its punishment are aggravated by the privileges they have abused. So tender is he of their feelings that he does not even name the cause of his grief, but leaves it to be inferred. He is assuring his countrymen, who regarded him as their enemy, of the sincerity and strength of his love for them. They are his brethren; the very name "Israelite" is to him a title of honor;* and he recounts in detail, certainly not in the manner of one touching a painful subject, the glorious distinctions which their nation had enjoyed through the favor of God. Calvin, who so often in his commentaries admirably traces the connection of thought, here hits the nail on the head: "Haec dignitatis elogia *testimonia sunt amoris.* Non enim solemus adeo benigne loqui, nisi de iis quos amamus."†

At the risk of being tedious, I will take some notice of Dr. Gifford's remarks in his recent and valuable Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. He says: "Paul's anguish is deepened by the memory of their privileges, most of all by the thought that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour, whom they have rejected."—But in Paul's

*See ch. xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22.

†The view which I have taken accords with that of Dr. Hodge. He says:—"The object of the Apostle in the introduction to this chapter, contained in the first five verses, is to assure the Jews of his love and of his respect for their peculiar privileges."—*Comm. on the Ep. to the Romans*, new ed. (1864), note on ix. 4, p. 469; see also p. 463.

enumeration of the privileges of the Jews he has in view not merel
their present condition but their whole past history, illuminated as i
had been by light from heaven. Will it be seriously maintained tha
Paul did not regard the peculiar privileges which the Jewish natio
had enjoyed for so many ages, as gifts of God's goodness for whic
eternal gratitude was due?—But "his anguish was deepened mos
of all by the thought that their race gave birth to the Divin
Saviour"! Paul's grief for his unbelieving countrymen, then, ha
extinguished his gratitude for the inestimable blessings which he per
sonally owed to Christ; it had extinguished his gratitude for the fac
that the God who rules over all had sent his Son to be the Saviour o
the world! The dark cloud which hid the light just then from th
mass of his countrymen, but which he believed was soon to pas
away, had blotted the sun from the heavens. The advent of Chris
was no cause for thanksgiving; he could only bow his head i
anguish, deepened most of all by the thought that the Messiah ha
sprung from the race to which he himself belonged!

"His anguish was deepened by the memory of their privileges.
Paul does not say this; and is Dr. Gifford quite sure that this was th
way in which these privileges presented themselves to his mind? Ma
we not as naturally suppose that the thought of God's favor to hi
people in the past, whom he had so often recalled from their wande
ings, afforded some ground for the hope that they had not stumble
so as to fall and perish, but that their present alienation from Christ
contributing as it had done, in the overruling providence of God, t
the wider and more rapid spread of the gospel among the Gentiles
was only temporary? If we will let Paul be his own interprete
instead of reading unnatural thoughts between his lines, we shall tak
this view. "God hath *not* cast off HIS PEOPLE, whom he foreknew,
"whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and th
promises." "A hardening in part hath befallen Israel," but onl
"until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so (*or* then) a
Israel shall be saved." It is not for nothing that "theirs are th
fathers"; that they had such ancestors as Abraham, "the friend o
God," and Isaac, and Jacob; "as touching the gospel, they are ene
mies for the sake of the Gentiles, but as touching the election," a
the chosen people of God, "they are beloved for the fathers' sake.
"If the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump; and if the root is holy, s
are the branches." "God doth not repent of his calling and hi
gifts." "God hath shut up all [Jews and Gentiles] unto disobe
dience, that he might have mercy upon all." For the ancient prophec
is now fulfilled; the Deliverer hath come out of Zion, and "he shal

urn away ungodliness from Jacob." "O the depth of the riches," &c. Such were the thoughts which the past privileges of the Jews, in connection with the advent of Christ, as we see from the eleventh chapter of this Epistle, *actually* suggested to the mind of Paul.*

Can we then reasonably say, that when in his grand historic survey and enumeration of the distinctive privileges of the Jews, the Apostle reaches the culminating point in the advent of the Messiah, sprung from that race, a devout thanksgiving to God as the beneficent ruler over all is wholly out of place? Might we not rather ask, How could it be repressed?

We may then, I conceive, dismiss the *psychological* objection to the doxology, on which many have laid great stress, as founded on a narrow and superficial view of what we may reasonably suppose to have been in the Apostle's mind. And I am happy to see that so fair-minded and clear-sighted a scholar as Professor Dwight takes essentially the same view of the matter. (See above, p. 41.)

2. A second objection to a doxology here is founded on the relation of the first five verses of the chapter to what follows. A doxology, it is thought, unnaturally breaks the connection between the sixth verse and what precedes.

This argument is rarely adduced, and I should hardly have thought it worthy of notice were it not that Dr. Dwight seems to attach some weight to it, though apparently not much. (See above, p. 41 f.)

The first five verses of the chapter, as we have seen, are a conciliatory introduction to the treatment of a delicate and many-sided subject. This treatment begins with the sixth verse, which is introduced by the particle δέ, "but." Whether the last part of verse 5 is a doxology to God, or simply the climax of the privileges of the Jews, the δέ cannot refer to what *immediately* precedes. In either case, it refers to what is implied in verses 2 and 3, and meets the most prominent objection to the doctrine set forth by the Apostle in the preceding part of the Epistle. The thought is, The present condition of the great mass of my countrymen is indeed a sad one, and not the Jews as a nation, but Christians, are the true people of God; *but* it is not as if the promises of God have failed. (Comp. iii. 3, 4.) This simple statement of the connection of ver. 6 with what precedes seems to me all that is needed to meet the objection. The argument that a

*This appreciative recapitulation of the distinctions of the Jewish people would also serve to check the tendency of the Gentile Christians to self-conceit, and would lead them to recognize the important part of the despised Hebrews in the drama of the world's history. It would virtually say to them, "Glory not over the branches; but if thou gloriest, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." (Rom. xi. 18.)

doxology is inconsistent with the Apostle's state of mind has alread been answered.

3. A third objection, urged by many, is founded on the allege abruptness of the doxology, and the absence of any mention of Go in what precedes. Some also think that a doxology here would nee to be introduced by the particle δέ.

I cannot regard this objection as having any force. It is quite i accordance with the habit of Paul thus to turn aside suddenly to giv expression to his feelings of adoration and gratitude toward God. See Rom. i. 25; vii. 25 (where the genuineness of δέ is very doub ful); 2 Cor. ix. 15, where note the omission of δέ in the genuin text; 1 Tim. i. 17, where the doxology is suggested by the mentio of Christ. The doxology xi. 36, as has already been noticed (p. 89 is completely parallel in thought. Far more abrupt is the doxolog 2 Cor. xi. 31, ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οἶδεν, ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι, where the ascription of praise interposed between οἶδεν and ὅτι in an extraordinary manner.

It is very strange that it should be urged as an argument again the doxology that God is not *mentioned* in the preceding context. Th name does not occur, but almost every word in verses 4 and 5 sug gests the thought of God. So, to a Jew, the very name "Israelites" so "the adoption, and the glory, and the giving of the Law, and th covenants, and the service, and the promises"; and so above a ὁ χριστός, the Anointed of God, the Messiah; as to the flesh, sprun from the Jews, but as to his holy spirit the Son of God, the messen ger of God's love and mercy, not to the Jews alone, but to all th nations of the earth.

That the mention of Christ in such a connection as this shoul bring vividly to the mind of the Apostle the thought of God and h goodness, and thus lead to a doxology, is simply in accordance wit the conception of the relation of Christ to God which appears every where in this Epistle and in all his Epistles. While Christ, δι' οὗ τ πάντα, is the medium of communication of our spiritual blessing Paul constantly views them in relation to God, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, as th original Author and Source. The gospel is "the gospel of God

---

*"Ad hæc annotatum est hoc in scriptis beati Pauli, quod aliquoti in medio sermonis cursu veluti raptus orat, aut adorat, aut gratias agi aut glorificat Deum, præsertim ubi commemoratum est aliquid c mysteriis adorandis, aut ineffabili bonitate Dei."—Erasmus, *Apol. ad monachos quosdam Hispanos*, Opp. ix. (Lugd. Bat. 1706), col. 1044. C this subject, and on the position of εὐλογητός, see the valuable note the Rev. Joseph Agar Beet, *Comm. on St. Paul's Ep. to the Roman* 2d ed. (Lond. 1881), p. 269 f., 271.

'a power of God unto salvation"; the righteousness which it reveals s "a righteousness which is of God"; it is God who has set forth Christ as ἱλαστήριον, who "commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us"; who "spared not his own Son, but freely gave him for us all"; it is "God who raised him from the dead"; "what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and on account of sin," has done; the glory to which Christians are destined, as sons and heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ, is "the glory of God"; in short, "all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself through Jesus Christ," and "nothing shall separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Though no one can doubt that Paul was full of love and gratitude to Christ, so that we might expect frequent ascriptions to him of praise and glory, it is a remarkable fact that there is no doxology or thanksgiving to Christ in any of his Epistles except those to Timothy, the genuineness of which has been questioned by many modern scholars. These Epistles, at any rate, present marked peculiarities of style and language, and if written by Paul, were probably written near the close of his life. And in them there is but one doxology to Christ, and that not absolutely certain, on account of the ambiguity of the word κύριος (2 Tim. iv. 18); while the thanksgiving is a simple expression of thankfulness (1 Tim. i. 12), χάριν ἔχω, *gratias habeo* (not *ago*). One reason for this general absence of such ascriptions to Christ on the part of the Apostle seems to have been that habit of mind of which I have just spoken, and which makes it *a priori* more probable that the doxology in Rom. ix. 5 belongs to God. But this is a matter which will be more appropriately treated in another place.

As to the δέ, which Schultz insists would be necessary,* one needs only to look fairly at the passage to see that it would be wholly out of place; that a doxology to God involves no *antithetic* contrast between God and Christ, as Schultz and some others strangely imagine. Nor does δέ as a particle of transition seem natural here, much less required. It would make the doxology too formal.

4. It is urged that "ὁ ὤν, grammatically considered, is more easily and naturally construed in connection with χριστός, than as the subject of a new and doxological clause." (See Dr. Dwight's article, pp. 24, 25, above.)

Much stronger language than this is often used. Dr. Hodge, for

* *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.*, 1868, xiii. 470 f., 477.

example, assuming that ὁ ὤν must be equivalent to ὅς ἐστι, says tha the interpretation which refers the words to Christ is the only on "which can, with the least regard to the rules of construction, b maintained." (*Comm.* in loc., p. 472.)

Dr. Dwight, whose article is in general so admirable for the fai ness, clearness, and moderation of its statements, has expressed him self here in such a way that I cannot feel perfectly sure of his meaning He says, speaking of the connection of ὁ ὤν with ὁ χριστός, "Th construction of ὁ ὤν, in cases similar to that which is here presented is the almost universal one both in the New Testament and in othe Greek."—If "cases similar to that which is here presented" mean cases in which ὁ ὤν (or any participle with the article) is preceded b a noun to which it may be easily joined, while it also admits of bein regarded as the subject of an independent sentence, and it is affirme that in such grammatically ambiguous cases it almost invariably *do* refer to the preceding subject, the argument is weighty, if the asse tion is true. But not even *one* such case has ever, to my knowledge been pointed out. Till such a case, or rather a sufficient number c such cases to serve as the basis of a reasonable induction, shall b produced, I am compelled to consider the statement as resting on n evidence whatever. Yet that this is what is meant by "similar cases seems necessarily to follow from what is said further on (p. 24) abou "the peculiarity of Rom. ix. 5." Cases in which ὁ ὤν, grammati cally considered, *can* only refer to a preceding subject, are certainl not "similar cases to that which is here presented," in which, as Dr Dwight admits, "there is, at the most, only a presumption in favo of this construction of the clause as against the other" (p. 25).

But if Dr. Dwight's statement means, or is intended to imply, tha ὁ ὤν with its adjuncts, or, in general, the participle with the article almost universally forms a descriptive or a limiting clause referring t a preceding subject, while its use as the independent subject of sentence is rare, the assertion is fatally incorrect. The latter use i not only very common, but in the New Testament, at least, is mor frequent than the former. We have (*a*) ὁ ὤν, or οἱ ὄντες, in th nominative, as the subject of an independent sentence, Matt. xii. 3c Mark xiii. 16 (text. rec.); Luke vi. 3 (t. r., Tisch.); xi. 23; John ii 31; vi. 46; viii. 47; ix. 40; Acts xxii. 9; Rom. viii. 5, 8. *Contr* (*b*), referring to a preceding subject, and forming, as I understand i an *appositional* clause, John i. 18; iii. 13 (text. rec.); (Acts v. 17; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Rev. v. 5 (t. r.); a *limiting* clause, John xi. 31; xi 17; Acts xi. 1. To these may be added 2 Cor. v. 4; Eph. ii. 13 where the clause is in apposition with or describes ἡμεῖς or ὑμεῖ

xpressed or understood; and perhaps John xviii. 37 (πᾶς ὁ ὢν κ. λ.).*

It is uncertain whether Col. iv. 11 belongs under (*a*) or (*b*); see Meyer *in loc.* For the examples of ὢν I have relied on Bruder's Concordance, p. 255, No. VI. But as there is nothing peculiar n the use of this particular participle with the article, so far as the resent question is concerned, I have, with the aid of Bruder,† exam-ned the occurrences of the participle in general, in the nominative, ith the article, in the Gospel of Matthew, the Epistle to the Romans, nd the First Epistle to the Corinthians. I find in Matthew 86 ex-mples of its use (*a*) as the subject, or in a very few cases (9) as the redicate, of a verb expressed or understood, and only 38 of its use *b*) in a descriptive or limiting clause, annexed to a preceding sub-ect; in the Epistle to the Romans 28 examples of the former kind gainst 12 of the latter; and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians 9 of the former against 4 of the latter, one of these being a false eading.‡

In general, it is clear that the use of the participle with the article, s the subject of an independent sentence, instead of being excep-ional in the New Testament, is far more common than its use as an ttributive. Nor is this strange; for ὁ ὤν properly signifies not "who s," but "he who is." The force of the article is not lost.§ While

*The examples of ὁ ὤν and other participles with πᾶς belong perhaps uite as properly under (*a*). Without πᾶς, the ὁ ὤν κ. τ. λ. is the sub-ect of the sentence, and the meaning is the same; πᾶς only strengthens he ὁ ὤν. See Krüger, *Gr. Sprachlehre*, 5te Aufl. (1875), § 50. 4. Anm. 1.

†*Concordantiae*, etc., p. 586, No. 2; p. 598, No. VII. 1; comp. p. 603, No. VIII.; 604, No. IX.

‡In this reckoning, to prevent any cavil, I have included under (*b*) all he examples of πᾶς ὁ or πάντες οἱ, of which there are 8 in Matthew, 2 n Romans, and 1 in 1 Cor.; also the cases of the article and participle vith σύ or ὑμεῖς as the subject of the verb, expressed or understood, of vhich there are 4 in Matthew and 7 in Romans. I have not counted on ither side Rom. viii. 33, 34, and ix. 33; the first two, translated accord-ng to the text of the Revised Version, belong under (*a*), according to ts margin, under (*b*); Rom. ix. 33, if we omit πᾶς, with all the critical ditors, would also belong under (*a*).

§ "Participles take the article only when some relation already known or especially noteworthy (*is qui, quippe qui*) is indicated, and conse-quently the idea expressed by the participle is to be made more promi-nent."—Winer, *Gram.* 7te Aufl., § 20, 1. b. *a.* c. p. 127 (p. 134 Thayer).

in some of its uses it may seem interchangeable with ὃς ἐστι, it differs in this, that it is generally employed either in appositional or in limiting clauses, in distinction from descriptive or additive clauses, while ὅς with the finite verb is appropriate for the latter. For examples of the former, see John i. 18; xii. 17; of the latter, Rom. v. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 4. To illustrate the difference by the passage before us: if ὁ ὤν here refers to ὁ χριστός, the clause would be more exactly translated as appositional, not "*who* is," &c., but "*he who* is God over all, blessed for ever," implying that he was well known to the readers of the Epistle as God, or at least marking this predicate with special emphasis; while ὃς ἐστιν would be more appropriate if it were simply the purpose of the Apostle to predicate deity of Christ, and would also be perfectly unambiguous.

There is nothing, then, either in the proper meaning of ὁ ὤν, or in its usage, which makes it more easy and natural to refer it to ὁ χριστός, than to take it as introducing an independent sentence. It is next to be observed, that there are circumstances which make the latter construction easy, and which distinguish the passage from nearly all others in which ὁ ὤν, or a participle with the article, is used as an attributive. In all the other instances in the New Testament of this use of ὁ ὤν or οἱ ὄντες in the nominative, with the single exception of the parenthetic insertion in 2 Cor. xi. 31 (see above, page 94), it *immediately* follows the subject to which it relates. The same is generally true of other examples of the participle with the article. (The strongest cases of exception which I have noticed are John vii. 50 and 2 John 7.) But here ὁ ὤν is separated from ὁ χριστός by τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, which in reading *must* be followed by a pause, a pause which is lengthened by the special emphasis given to the κατὰ σάρκα by the τοῦ,* and the sentence which precedes is complete in itself grammatically, and requires nothing further logically, for it was only as to the flesh that Christ was from the Jews. On the other hand, as we have seen (p. 88) the enumeration of blessings which immedi-

* If ὁ χριστός were placed after κατὰ σάρκα, the ambiguity would not indeed be wholly removed, but it would be much more natural to refer the ὁ ὤν to Christ than it is now. Perhaps the feeling of this led Cyril of Alexandria to make this transposition, as he does in quoting the passage against the Emperor Julian, who maintained that "neither Paul dared to call Christ God, nor Matthew, nor Luke, nor Mark, ἀλλ' ὁ χριστὸς Ἰουδαῖος." See Cyril. *cont. Julian.* lib. x. *Opp.* vi. b. p. 328 b ed. Aubert. In two other instances Cyril quotes the passage in the same way; *Opp.* v. b. pp. 118 a, 148 e: though he usually follows the order of the present Greek text.

ately precedes, crowned by the inestimable blessing of the advent Christ, naturally suggests an ascription of praise and thanksgiving God as the Being who rules over all; while a doxology is also ggested by the Ἀμήν at the end of the sentence.* From every oint of view, therefore, the doxological construction seems easy and atural. The ellipsis of the verb ἐστί or ὤν in such cases is simply ecording to rule. The construction numbered 6 above (see p. 96) also perfectly easy and natural grammatically: see 2 Cor. i. 21; 5; Heb. iii. 4.

The naturalness of a pause after σάρκα is further indicated by the ct that we find a point after this word in all our oldest MSS. that stify in the case, namely, A B C L, and in at least eight cursives, ough the cursives have been rarely examined with reference to their nctuation. †

It has been urged (see above, p. 24), that if the writer did not tend that ὁ ὢν should be referred to Christ, he would have adopted nother construction for his sentence, which would be exposed to no uch misapprehension. But this argument is a boomerang. Mr. eet in his recent Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (2d i., p. 271 f.) well says, on the other hand:—

"Had Paul thought fit to deviate from his otherwise unvarying stom and to speak of Christ as *God*, he must have done so with a rious and set purpose of asserting the divinity of Christ. And if so, e would have used words which no one could misunderstand. In a milar case, John i. 1, we find language which excludes all doubt. nd in this case the words ὁ ἐστίν, as in i. 25, would have given qual certainty . . . Moreover, here Paul has in hand an altogether fferent subject, the present position of the Jews. And it seems to e much more likely that he would deviate from his common mode f expression, and write once 'God be blessed' instead of 'to God e glory,' than that in a passage which does not specially refer to the ature of Christ, he would assert, what he nowhere else explicitly

---

*In 15 out of the 18 instances in the N. T., besides the present, in hich Ἀμήν at the end of a sentence is probably genuine, it follows a oxology; viz.: Rom. i. 25; xi. 36; xvi. 27; Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 21; Phil. . 20; 1 Tim. i. 17; vi. 16; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11; . 11; (2 Pet. iii. 18;) Jude 25; Rev. i. 6; vii. 12.—*Contra*, Rom. xv. 33; al. vi. 18; (Rev. i. 7.)

†The MSS. ℵ D F G cannot be counted on one side or the other; respect- g K we have no information. For a fuller statement of the facts in he case, see Note A at the end of this article.

asserts, that Christ is God, and assert it in language which may either mean this or something quite different."

Many writers, like Dr. Gifford, speak of that construction which refers ὁ ὤν &c., to Christ as "the natural and simple" one, "which every Greek scholar would adopt without hesitation, if no doctrine were involved."—It might be said in reply, that the natural and simple construction of words considered apart from the doctrine it involves, and with reference to merely lexical and grammatical considerations, is by no means always the true one. For example, according to the natural construction of the words ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστε (John viii. 44), their meaning is, "you are from the father of the devil," and probably no Greek scholar would think of putting any other meaning on them, if no question of doctrine were involved. Again, in Luke ii. 38, "she gave thanks unto God, and spake of him to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem," how unnatural, it may be said, to refer the "him" to any subject but "God," there being no other possible antecedent mentioned in this or in the three preceding verses! But I do not make or need to make this reply. We have already considered the grammatical side of the question, and have seen, I trust, that the construction which makes ὁ ὤν &c. the subject of a new sentence is perfectly simple and easy. I only add here that the meaning of words often depends on the way they are read; on the pauses, and tones of voice. (If we could only have heard Paul dictate this passage to Tertius!) And it is a matter of course, that when a person has long been accustomed, from whatever cause, to read and understand a passage in a particular way, any other mode of reading it will seem to him unnatural. But this impression will often be delusive. And it does not follow, that a mode of understanding the passage which was easy and natural in the third and fourth centuries, or even earlier when it had become common to apply the name θεός to Christ, would have seemed the most easy and natural to the first readers of the Epistle. I waive here all considerations of doctrine, and call attention only to the use of language. When we observe that everywhere else in this Epistle the Apostle has used the word θεός of the Father in distinction from Christ, so that it is virtually a proper name; that this is also true of the Epistles previously written, those to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians; how can we reasonably doubt that if the verbal ambiguity here occasioned a momentary hesitation as to the meaning, a primitive reader of the Epistle would naturally suppose that the word θεός designated the being everywhere else denoted by this name in the Apostle's writings, and would give the passage

e construction thus suggested? But this is a point which will be nsidered more fully in another place.

The objection that, if we make the last clause a doxology to God, the participle ὤν is superfluous and awkward," will be noticed below nder No. 6.

5. It is further urged that τὸ κατὰ σάρκα requires an antithesis, hich is supposed to be supplied by what follows. Some even say at κατὰ σάρκα must mean "according to his human nature," and erefore requires as an antithesis the mention of the divine nature of hrist. But the proper antithesis to κατὰ σάρκα is κατὰ πνεῦμα, not τὰ τὴν θεότητα, which there is nothing in the phrase itself to sug-st: κατὰ σάρκα, as will at once appear on examining the cases of its e in the New Testament, does not refer to a distinction of *natures*, t often denotes a physical relation, such for example as depends on rth or other outward circumstances, in contrast with a spiritual rela-on. We need only refer to the 3d verse of this very chapter, which rtainly does not imply that Paul or his "kinsmen κατὰ σάρκα" had a vine nature also. The phrase κατὰ σάρκα undoubtedly implies an tithesis; "as to the flesh," by his natural birth and in his merely tward relations the Messiah, the Son of David, was from the Jews, d in this they might glory; but as Son of God and in his higher, iritual relations, he belonged to all mankind. It was not to the postle's purpose to describe what he was κατὰ πνεῦμα, as he is speaking the *peculiar* distinctions of the Jews. Indeed, the antithesis to τὰ σάρκα is very often not expressed; see, for example, Rom. iv. 1; . 3; 1 Cor. i. 26; x. 18; 2 Cor. v. 16; Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22; so at Alford judiciously says: "I do not reckon among the objections e want of any antithesis to κατὰ σάρκα, because that might have well en left to the readers to supply." We have an example strikingly rallel to the present in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Cor-thians (c. 32), first adduced so far as I know by Dr. Whitby in his *ast Thoughts*, which at least demonstrates that in a case like this the pression of an antithesis is not required. Speaking of the high dis-nctions of the patriarch Jacob, Clement says: "For from him were l the priests and Levites that ministered to the altar of God; from m was the Lord Jesus *as to the flesh* (τὸ κατὰ σάρκα); from him were ngs and rulers and leaders in the line of Judah."

The eminent Dutch commentator, Van Hengel, maintains in an aborate note on this passage, citing many examples, that the form the restrictive phrase here used, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, with the neuter ticle prefixed, absolutely requires a pause after σάρκα, and does not lmit, according to Greek usage, of the *expression* of an antithesis

after it, so that the following part of the verse must be referred t God. (Comp. Rom. i. 15; xii. 18.) He represents his view as sup ported by the authority of the very distinguished Professor C. G Cobet of Leyden, who as a master of the Greek language has perhap no superior among European scholars.*

It may be true that Greek usage in respect to such restrictiv expressions, when τό or τά is prefixed, accords with the statement Van Hengel, endorsed by Cobet. In my limited research I hav found no exception. The two passages cited by Meyer in oppositio (see above, p. 27) seem to me wholly irrelevant; the former, becaus we have μέν with the τὸ ἐπ' ἐμοί, which of course requires an ant thetic clause with δέ; the latter, because the essential element in th case, the τό or τά, does not stand before κατὰ τὸ ἄστυ. But I mus agree with Dr. Dwight (p. 28) that Van Hengel's argument is no conclusive. On the supposition that ὁ ὤν, &c., refers to Christ, w have not a formal antithesis, such as would be excluded by Va Hengel's rule, but simply an appositional, descriptive clause, settin forth the exalted dignity of him who as to the flesh sprang from th Jews. I cannot believe that there is any law of the Greek languag which forbids this.

We may say, however, and it is a remark of some importance, tha the τό before κατὰ σάρκα, laying stress on the restriction, and suggest ing an antithesis which therefore did not need to be expressed, indi cates that the writer has done with that point, and makes a paus natural; it makes it easy to take the ὁ ὤν as introducing an indepen dent sentence, though it does not, as I believe, make it necessary t take it so.

I admit further, that if we assume that the conception of Christ a God was familiar to the readers of the Epistle, and especially if w suppose that they had often heard him called so by the early preach ers of Christianity, the application of the ὁ ὤν, &c., to Christ her would be natural, and also very suitable to the object of the Apostl in this passage. I am obliged to say, however, that this is assumin what is not favored by Paul's use of language, or by the record of th apostolic preaching in the book of Acts.

On the other hand, there was no need of such an appendage t ὁ χριστός. We have only to consider the glory and dignity wit

---

*See Van Hengel, *Interp. Ep. Pauli ad Rom.* tom. ii. (1859), pp. 348 353, and pp. 804–813. Speaking of his citations, he says (p. 350 "Allatorum unum alterumque mecum communicavit COBETIUS noster se multo plura, quibus interpretatio mea confirmaretur, suppeditar posse dicens."

hich the name of the Messiah was invested in the mind of a Jew, nd the still higher glory and dignity associated with *ὁ χριστός* in the ind of a Christian, and especially in the mind of Paul.

6. It is further objected that in sentences which begin with a doxology or an ascription of blessing *εὐλογητός* (or *εὐλογημένος*) always recedes the subject; and that "the laws" or "rules of grammar" Stuart, Alford) require that it should do so here to justify the conruction proposed. So in the N. T. *εὐλογητός* stands first in the oxologies Luke i. 68; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3; and so *λογητός* and *εὐλογημένος* precede the subject in a multitude of laces in the Septuagint. (See Tromm's Concordance, and Wahl's *lavis librorum Vet. Test. apocryphorum.*)

Great stress has been laid on this objection by many; but I believe at a critical examination will show that it has no real weight.

We will begin by considering a misconception of the meaning of *ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* which has led to untenable objections against the oxological construction, and has prevented the reason for the position *εὐλογητός* from being clearly seen. It has been assumed by many at the phrase is simply equivalent to "the Supreme God" (so Vahl, *s. v. ἐπί, omnibus superior, omnium summus*)*, as if the Apostle as contrasting God with Christ in respect to dignity, instead of simy describing God as the being who rules over all. This misunderanding of the expression occasioned the chief difficulty felt by De Vette in adopting the construction which places a colon or a period after *ρκα*; it seemed to him like "throwing Christ right into the shade," ithout any special reason, when we should rather expect something id in antithesis to *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, to set forth his dignity; though he dmits that this objection is removed, if we accept Fritzsche's explaation of the passage.† On this false view is founded Schultz's notion ee above, p. 95) that *δέ* would be needed here to indicate the ntithesis. On it is also grounded the objection of Alford, Farrar,

---

* Wahl gives a more correct view of the use of *ἐπί* in his *Clavis libr. et. Test. apocr.* (1853), p. 218, col. 1, C. b., where *εἰμὶ ἐπί* with the genive is defined, *praesum alicui rei, moderor* s. *administro aliquam rem.* mp. Grimm's *Lexicon Gr.-Lat. in libros N. T.*, ed. 2da, *s. v. ἐπί*, . 1. d. p. 160, col. 2; Rost and Palm's Passow, vol. i. p. 1035, col. 1, 3; nd the references given by Meyer and Van Hengel *in loc.* See Acts ii. 27; xii. 20; Gen. xliv. 1; Judith xiv. 13, *εἶπαν τῷ ὄντι ἐπὶ πάντων τοῦ*.

† De Wette, *Kurze Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer*, 4te Aufl. 847), p. 130.

and others, that the ὤν is "perfectly superfluous," as indeed it would be, if that were simply the meaning intended. To express the idea of "the God over all," "the Supreme God," in contrast with a being to whom the term "God" might indeed be applied, but only in a lower sense, we should need only ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, a phrase which is thus used numberless times in the writings of the Christian Fathers; see, for examples, Wetstein's note on Rom. ix. 5. But, as I understand the passage, the ὤν is by no means superfluous. It not only gives an impressive fulness to the expression, but converts what would otherwise be a mere epithet of God into a *substantive* designation of him, equivalent to "the Ruler over All," on which the mind rests for a moment by itself, before it reaches the θεός qualified by it; or θεός *may* be regarded as added by way of apposition or more precise definition. The *position* of this substantive designation of θεός, between the article and its noun, gives it special prominence. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 7, οὔτε ὁ φυτεύων ἐστί τι, οὔτε ὁ ποτίζων, ἀλλ' ὁ αὐξάνων θεός; Addit. ad Esth. viii. l. 39, ὁ τὰ πάντα δυναστεύων θεός, cf. ll. 8, 35, Tisch.; ὁ πάντων δεσπόζων θεός, Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 15; ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς θεός, *ibid.* i. 26. In expressions of this kind the definite article fulfils, I conceive, a double function: it is connected with the participle or other adjunct which immediately follows it, just as it would be if the substantive at the end were omitted; but at the same time it makes that substantive definite, so that the article in effect belongs to the substantive as well as to the participle. Thus ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός is equivalent to ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων in everything except the difference in *prominence* given to the different parts of the phrase in the two expressions. In the latter, ὁ θεός is made prominent by its position; in the former, prominence is given to the particular conception expressed by ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, "the Ruler over All."*

Let us look now for a moment at the connection of thought in the passage before us, and we shall see that this distinction is important. The Apostle is speaking of the favored nation to which it is his pride to belong. Its grand religious history of some two thousand years

*If this account is correct it follows that neither of the rendering which I have suggested above (p. 89) as expressing my view of the meaning represents the original perfectly; nor do I perceive that the English idiom admits of a perfect translation. If we render, "he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever," we make the word "God" stand in simple apposition to "he who is over all," which I do not suppose to be the *grammatical* construction; if on the other hand we translate, "he who is God over all be blessed for ever," we lose in a great measure the effect of the position of the ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων before θεός.

asses rapidly before his mind as in a panorama. Their ancestors ere the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; theirs were "the loption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the aw, and the temple-service, and the promises." But God's choice nd training of his "peculiar people," and the privileges conferred upon em, were all a providential preparation for the advent of the Messiah, hose birth from among the Jews was their highest national dis-nction and glory, while his mission as the founder of a spiritual nd *universal* religion was the crowning manifestation of God's love nd mercy to mankind. How could this survey of the ages of prom-e and preparation, and the great fulfilment in Christ, fail to bring vidly before the mind of the Apostle the thought of God as *the eing who presides over all things*,—who cares for all men and con-ols all events?* Because this conception is prominent in his mind e places the ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων first in the sentence. A recognition of is fact removes all the difficulty about the position of εὐλογητός. here is no "law of grammar" bearing on the matter except the law at the predicate, when it is more prominent in the mind of the riter, precedes the subject. In simply exclamatory doxologies, the λογητός or εὐλογημένος comes first, because the feeling that prompts s use is predominant, and can be expressed in a single word. But ere, where the thought of the overruling providence of God is prom-ent, the ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων *must* stand first in the sentence, to express

*Erasmus has well presented the thought of the Apostle:—"Ut enim aec omnia, quae commemorat de adoptione, gloria, testamentis, legis-tione, cultibus, ac promissis, deque patribus, ex quibus Christus juxta arnem ortus est, declaret non fortuito facta, sed admirabili Dei provi-entia, qui tot modis procuravit salutem humani generis, non simplic-er dicit Deus, sed is qui rebus omnibus praeest, omnia suo divino con-lio dispensans moderansque, cui dicit deberi laudem in omne aevum, o insignem erga nos charitatem, cui maledicebant Judaei, dum Filium nicum blasphemiis impeterent."—Note *in loc.*, in his *Opp.* vi. (Lugd. at. 1705), col. 611.

So Westcott and Hort in their note on this passage in vol. ii. of their reek Testament, remarking on the punctuation which places a colon fter σάρκα as "an expression of the interpretation which implies that pecial force was intended to be thrown on ἐπὶ πάντων by the interposi-on of ὤν," observe:—"This emphatic sense of ἐπὶ πάντων (cf. i. 16; ii. 9 ; iii. 29 f.; x. 12; xi. 32, 36) is fully justified if St. Paul's purpose is to uggest that the tragic apostacy of the Jews (vv. 2, 3) is itself part of the ispensations of "Him who is God over all," over Jew and Gentile alike, ver past present and future alike; so that the ascription of blessing to im is a homage to His Divine purpose and power of bringing good ut of evil in the course of the ages (xi. 13 16; 25–36)."—Dr. Hort re-narks that "this punctuation alone seems adequate to account for the hole of the language employed, more especially when it is considered relation to the context."

that prominence; and the position of *εὐλογητός* after it is required by the very same law of the Greek language which governs all the examples that have been alleged against the doxological construction of the passage. This thought of God as the Ruler over All re-appears in the doxology at the end of the eleventh chapter (xi. 36), where the Apostle concludes his grand Theodicy: "For from Him, and through Him, and to Him, are ALL THINGS: to Him is the glory for ever! Amen." Compare also Eph. i. 11, cited by Mr. Beet: "foreordained according to the purpose of him who worketh ALL THINGS after the counsel of his will;" and so in another doxology (1 Tim. i. 17) suggested by the mention of Christ, the ascription is *τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων*, "to the King OF THE AGES."*

I prefer, on the whole, to take *πάντων* as neuter; but much might be said in favor of the view of Fritzsche, whose note on this passage is especially valuable. He, with many other scholars, regards it as masculine: "*Qui omnibus praeest hominibus* (i. e. qui et Judaeis et gentilibus consulit Deus, der ueber allen Menschen waltende Gott) *sit celebratus perpetuo, amen.*" (C. F. A. Fritzsche, *Pauli ad Rom. Epist.*, tom. ii. [1839], p. 272.) He refers for the *πάντων* to Rom. x. 12; xi. 32; iii. 29.

We may note here, that while the Apostle says *ὧν οἱ πατέρες*, he does not say *ὧν*, but *ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός*. He could not forget the thought, which pervades the Epistle, that the Messiah was for *all* men alike. Nor does he forget that while by natural descent, *κατὰ σάρκα*, Christ was "from the Jews," he was *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, and in all that constituted him the Messiah, "from GOD," who "anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power," who "made him both Lord and Christ," who marked him out as his "Son" by raising him from the dead (Acts xiii. 33; Rom. i. 4) and setting him at his right hand in the heavenly places, and giving him to be the head over all things to the Church (Eph. i. 20–22), that Church in which there is no distinction of "Greek and Jew," "but Christ is all, and in all."

That such words as *εὐλογητός*, *εὐλογημένος*, *μακάριος*, and *ἐπικατάρατος* should usually stand first in the sentence in expressions of benediction, macarism, and malediction, is natural in Greek for the

---

*This seems to me the true rendering, rather than "to the King *eternal*," though eternity is implied. Comp. Rev. xv. 3 Westc. and Hort; Sir. xxxvi. 22 (al. xxxiii. 19); Tob. xiii. 6, 10; Ps. cxliv. (cxlv.) 13; Clem. Rom. *Ep. ad Cor.* cc. 35, 3; 55, 6; 61, 2; Const. Apost. vii. 34; Lit. S. Jac. c. 13. So Exod. xv. 18, *κύριος βασιλεύων τῶν αἰώνων*, as cited by Philo, *De Plant. Noë*, c. 12 *bis* (*Opp.* i. 336, 337 ed. Mang.), *De Mundo* c. 7 (*Opp.* ii. 608), and read in many cursive MSS.; Joseph. *Ant.* i. 18, § 6, *δέσποτα παντὸς αἰῶνος*. *Contra*, Test. xii Patr., *Ruben*, c. 6.

same reason that it is natural in English to give the first place to such words as "blessed," "happy," "cursed." It makes no difference, as a study of the examples will show, whether the expression be *optative*, as is usually the case with *εὐλογημένος*, with the ellipsis of *εἴη* or *ἔστω*, or *declarative*, as in the case of *μακάριος*, and usually, I believe, of *εὐλογητός*, *ἔστι* being understood.* The ellipsis of the substantive verb gives rapidity and force to the expression, indicating a certain glow of feeling. But in Greek as in English, if the subject is more prominent in the mind of the writer, and is not overweighted with descriptive appendages, there is nothing to hinder a change of order, but the genius of the language rather requires it.

The example commonly adduced of this variation in the case of *εὐλογητός* is Ps. lxvii. (Heb. lxviii.) 20, *Κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός, εὐλογητὸς κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν*, where we find *εὐλογητός* in both positions. This peculiarity is the result of a misconstruction and perhaps also of a false reading (Meyer) of the Hebrew. The example shows that the position of *εὐλογητός* after the subject violates no law of the Greek language; but on account of the repetition of *εὐλογητός* I do not urge it as a parallel to Rom. ix. 5. (See above, p. 32 f.). On the other hand, the passage cited by Grimm (see above, p. 34) from the apocryphal Psalms of Solomon, viii. 41, 42, written probably about 48 B. C., seems to me quite to the purpose:

αἰνετὸς κύριος ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν αὐτοῦ ἐν στόματι ὁσίων,
καὶ σὺ εὐλογημένος, Ἰσραήλ, ὑπὸ κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. †

Here, in the first line, *αἰνετός* precedes, because the predicate is emphatic; but in the second, the subject *σύ* precedes, because it is meant to receive the emphasis. I perceive no antithesis or studied chiasmus here. The sentence is no more a "double" or "compound" one than Gen. xiv. 19, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33; Ps. lxxi.

*I believe that *εὐλογητός* in doxologies is distinguished from *εὐλογημένος* as *laudandus* is from *laudatus*; and that the doxology in Rom. ix. 5 is therefore strictly a declarative, not an optative one. The most literal and exact rendering into Latin would be something like this: "Ille qui est super omnia Deus laudandus (est) in aeternum!" Where the verb is expressed with *εὐλογητός* (as very often in the formula *εὐλογητὸς εἶ*) it is always, I believe, in the indicative. Here I must express my surprise that Canon Farrar (*The Expositor*, vol. ix. p. 402; vol. x. p. 238) should deny that Rom. i. 25 and 2 Cor. xi. 31 are "doxologies." What is a doxology but a pious ascription of glory or praise? If *ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν*, Rom. i. 25, is "not a doxology at all" on account of the *ἐστιν*, then Matt. vi. 13 (text rec.) and 1 Pet. iv. 11 are, for the same reason, not doxologies.

† See O. F. Fritzsche, *Libri apoc. V. T. Gr.* (1871), p. 579, or Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum* (1869), p. 14.

(lxxii.) 18, 19; Tob. xi. 13, and 16 (Sin.); Judith xiii. 18; Orat. Azar. 2; and I see no reason why the fact that the clauses are connected by *καί* should affect the position of *εὐλογητός* here more than in those passages—no reason why it should affect it at all.

Another example in which the subject precedes *ἐπικατάρατος* and *εὐλογημένος* in an optative or possibly a predictive sentence is Gen. xxvii. 29, *ὁ καταρώμενός σε ἐπικατάρατος, ὁ δὲ εὐλογῶν σε εὐλογημένος.* Here the Greek follows the order of the Hebrew, and the reason for the unusual position in both I suppose to be the fact that the contrast between *ὁ καταρώμενος* and *ὁ εὐλογῶν* naturally brought the subjects into the foreground. It is true that in Rom. ix. 5, as I understand the passage (though others take a different view), there is no antithesis, as there is here; but the example shows that when for any reason the writer wishes to make the subject prominent, there is no law of the Greek language which imprisons such a predicate as *εὐλογημένος* at the beginning of the sentence.

Another example, in a declarative sentence, but not the less pertinent on that account (the verb not being expressed), is Gen. xxvi. 29, according to what I believe to be the true reading, *καὶ νῦν σὺ εὐλογητὸς ὑπὸ κυρίου*, where the *σὺ* being emphatic, as is shown by the corresponding order in Hebrew, stands before *εὐλογητός*. Contrast Gen. iii. 14; iv. 11; Josh. ix. 29 (al. 23). This reading is supported by *all* the uncial MSS. that contain the passage, viz., I. Cod. Cotton. (cent. v.), III. Alex. (v.), X. Coislin. (VII.), and Bodl. (VIII. or IX.) ed. Tisch. *Mon. Sacr. Ined.* vol. ii. (1857), p. 234, with at least 25 cursives, and the Aldine edition, also by all the ancient versions except the Ethiopic, and the Latin, which translates freely, against the *καὶ νῦν εὐλογημένος σύ* of the Roman edition, which has very little authority here.

Still another case where in a declarative sentence the usual order of subject and predicate is reversed, both in the Greek and the Hebrew, is 1 Kings ii. 45 (al. 46), *καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμὼν εὐλογημένος*, the ellipsis being probably *ἔσται*. Here I suppose the reason for the exceptional order to be the contrast between Solomon and Shimei (ver. 44).

It is a curious fact that *μακαριστός*, a word perfectly analogous to *εὐλογητός*, and which would naturally stand first in the predicate, happens to follow the subject in the only instances of its use in the Septuagint which come into comparison here, viz.: Prov. xiv. 21; xvi. 20; xxix. 18. The reason seems to be the same as in the case we have just considered; there is a contrast of subjects. For the same reason *ἐπικατάρατος* follows the subject in Wisd. xiv. 8 (comp. ver. 7).

These examples go to confirm Winer's statement in respect to contrasted subjects. And I must here remark, in respect to certain passages which have been alleged in opposition (see above, p. 36), that I can perceive no contrast of subjects in Gen. xiv. 19, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33; and still less in Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 53, where the doxology appears to have no relation to what precedes, but to be rather the formal doxology, appended by the compiler, which concludes the Third Book of the Psalms (comp. Ps. xl. (xli.) 14).

It may be said that none of the examples we have been considering is *precisely* similar to Rom. ix. 5. But they all illustrate the fact that there is nothing to hinder a Greek writer from changing the ordinary position of *εὐλογητός* and kindred words when from any cause the subject is naturally more prominent in his mind. They show that the *principle* of the rule which governs the position may authorize or require a deviation from the common order. I must further agree with Meyer and Ellicott on Eph. i. 3, and Fritzsche on Rom. ix. 5, in regarding as not altogether irrelevant such passages as Ps. cxii. (cxiii.) 2, *εἴη τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου εὐλογημένον*, where, though *εἴη* precedes, as a copula it can have no emphasis, and the position of *εὐλογημένον* is determined by the fact that the subject rather than the predicate here naturally presents itself first to the mind. The difference between such a sentence and *εὐλογημένον τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου* is like that in English between "May the name of the Lord be blessed" and "Blessed be the name of the Lord." It is evident, I think, that in the latter sentence the predicate is made more prominent, and in the former the subject; but if a person does not *feel* this, it cannot be proved. Other examples of this kind are Ruth ii. 19; 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chron. ix. 8; Job i. 21; Dan. ii. 20; Lit. S. Jac. c. 19; Lit. S. Marci, c. 20, a. (Hammond, pp. 52, 192.) In Ps. cxii. (cxiii.) 2 and Job i. 21 the prominence given to the subject is suggested by what precedes.

I will give one example of the fallacy of merely empirical rules respecting the position of words. Looking at Young's *Analytical Concordance*, there are, if I have counted right, 138 instances in which, in sentences like "Blessed be God," "Blessed are the meek," the word "blessed" precedes the subject in the common English Bible. There is no exception to this usage in the Old Testament or the New. "Here," exclaims the empiric, "is a law of the language. To say 'God be blessed' is not English." But if we look into the Apocrypha, we find that our translators *have* said it, namely in Tobit xi. 17, and so it stands also in the Genevan version, though the Greek reads *εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός*. Why the translators changed the

order must be a matter of conjecture; perhaps it was to make a contrast with the last clause of the sentence.

There is a homely but important maxim which has been forgotten in many discussions of the passage before us, that "circumstances alter cases." I have carefully examined all the examples of doxology or benediction in the New Testament and the Septuagint, and in other ancient writings, as the Liturgies, in which *εὐλογητός* or *εὐλογημένος* precedes the subject; and there is not one among them which, so far as I can judge, justifies the assumption that because *εὐλογητός* precedes the subject there, it would probably have done so here, had it been the purpose of Paul to introduce a doxology. The cases in which a doxology begins without a previous enumeration of blessings, but in which the *thought* of the blessing prompts an exclamation of praise or thanksgiving,—"Blessed be God, who" or "for he" has done this or that,—are evidently not parallel. All the New Testament doxologies with *εὐλογητός*, and most of those in the Septuagint, are of this character.* In all these cases, we perceive at once that any other order would be strange. The expression of the *feeling*, which requires but one word, naturally precedes the mention of the ground of the feeling, which often requires very many. But there is a difference between *εὐλογητός* and *εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*. Where it would be natural for the former to precede the subject, it might be more natural for the latter to follow. In the example adduced by Dr. Dwight in his criticism of Winer (see above, pp. 36, 37), it is evident that *εὐλογητός* more naturally stands first in the sentence; at the end it would be abrupt and unrhythmical. But I cannot think that a Greek scholar would find anything hard or unnatural in the sentence if it read, *ὁ διατηρήσας τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τύπον ἀμίαντον εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.*

To make the argument from usage a rational one, examples sufficient in number to form the basis of an induction should be produced in which in passages *like the present* *εὐλογητός* precedes the subject. Suppose we should read here *εὐλογητὸς ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, we instantly see that the reference of *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* becomes, to say the least, ambiguous, the "for ever" grammatically connecting itself with the phrase "he who is God over all" rather than with "blessed." If to avoid this we read, *εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ὁ ὢν*

* See Luke i. 68; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3.—Gen. xiv. 20; xxiv. 27; Ex. xviii. 10; Ruth iv. 14; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 39; 2 Sam. xviii. 28; 1 Kings i. 48; v. 7; viii. 15, 56; 2 Chr. ii. 12; vi. 4; Ezr. vii. 27; Ps. xxvii. (Sept.) 6; xxx. 22; lxv. 20; lxxi. 18; cxxiii. 6; cxxxiv. 21; cxliii. 1; Dan. iii. 28 Theodot., 95 Sept.

ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, we have a sentence made unnaturally heavy and clumsy by the interposition of εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας before the subject, a sentence to which I believe no parallel can be produced in the whole range of extant doxologies. Wherever εὐλογητός precedes, the subject *directly* follows. These objections to the transposition appear to me in themselves a sufficient reason why the Apostle should have preferred the present order. But we must also consider that any other arrangement would have failed to make prominent the particular conception of God, which the context suggests, as the Ruler over All. If, then, the blessings mentioned by the Apostle suggested to his mind the thought of God as εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, in view of that overruling providence which sees the end from the beginning, which brings good out of evil and cares for all men alike, I must agree with Winer that "the present position of the words is not only altogether suitable, but even necessary." (*Gram.*, 7te Aufl., § 61. 3. e. p. 513; p. 551 Thayer, p. 690 Moulton.) Olshausen, though he understands the passage as relating to Christ, well says:—"Rückert's remark, that εὐλογητός, when applied to God, must, according to the idiom of the Old and New Testament, always precede the noun, is of no weight. Köllner rightly observes, that the position of words is altogether [everywhere] not a mechanical thing, but determined, in each particular conjuncture, by the connexion, and by the purpose of the speaker."*

7. The argument founded on the notion that the Apostle here had in mind Ps. lxvii. (lxviii.) 20, and was thereby led to describe Christ as θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, is one which so far as I know never occurred to any commentator ancient or modern before the ingenious Dr. Lange. It is evidently so fanciful, and has been so completely demolished by Dr. Dwight (see above, p. 33, note), that any further notice of it would be a waste of words.

8. The argument for the reference of the ὁ ὤν, &c., to Christ, founded on supposed patristic authority, will be considered below under IV., in connection with the history of the interpretation of the passage.

II. I HAVE thus endeavored to show that the construction of the last part of the verse as a doxology suits the context, and that the principal objections urged against it have little or no weight.

* Olshausen, *Bibl. Comm. on the N. T.*, vol. iv. p. 88, note, Kendrick's trans.—The remark cited from Rückert belongs to the first edition of his Commentary (1831). In the second edition (1839) Rückert changed his view of the passage, and adopted the construction which makes the last part of the verse a doxology to God.

But the construction followed in the common version is also grammatically objectionable; and if we assume that the Apostle and those whom he addressed believed Christ to be God, this construction likewise suits the context.

How then shall we decide the question? If it was an ambiguous sentence in Plato or Aristotle, our first step would be to see what light was thrown on the probabilities of the case by *the writer's use of language elsewhere.* Looking then at the question from this point of view, I find three reasons for preferring the construction which refers the last part of the verse to God.

1. The use of the word εὐλογητός, "blessed," which never occurs in the New Testament in reference to Christ. If we refer εὐλογητός to God, our passage accords with the doxologies Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. i. 3; xi. 31; and Eph. i. 3. In Rom. i. 25 we have εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, as here; and 2 Cor. xi. 31, "The God and Father [*or* God the Father] of the Lord Jesus knows—he who is blessed for ever!—that I lie not," strongly favors the reference of the εὐλογητός to God.* It alone seems to me almost decisive. The word εὐλογητός is elsewhere in the New Testament used in doxologies to God (Luke i. 68; 1 Pet. i. 3); and in Mark xiv. 61, ὁ εὐλογητός, "the Blessed One," is a special designation of the Supreme Being, in accordance with the language of the later Jews, in whose writings God is often spoken of as "the Holy One, blessed be He!"

I have already spoken (see above, p. 95) of the rarity of doxologies to Christ in the writings of Paul, the only instance being 2 Tim. iv. 18, though here Fritzsche (*Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 268) and Canon Kennedy (*Ely Lectures,* p. 87) refer the κύριος to God. Doxologies and thanksgivings to God are on the other hand very frequent in his Epistles. Those with εὐλογητός are given above; for those with δόξα, see Rom. xi. 36; xvi. 27; Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 21; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17 (τιμὴ καὶ δόξα);—τιμὴ καὶ κράτος, 1 Tim. vi. 16. (Comp. δοξάζω, Rom. xv. 6, 9.) Thanksgivings, with χάρις first, Rom. vi. 17; vii. 25 (Lachm., Tisch., Treg., WH.); 2 Cor. viii. 16; ix. 15; τῷ δὲ θεῷ first, 1 Cor. xv. 57; 2 Cor. ii. 14; εὐχαριστῶ, Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4; (14.) xiv. 18; Eph. i. 16; Phil. i. 3; Col. i. 3, 12; 1 Thess. i. 2; ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 3; ii. 13; Philem. 4. Note especially the direction, "*giving thanks always* for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ *to God,* even the Father," Eph. v. 20; comp. Col. iii. 17, "do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, *giving thanks to God*

*For the way in which the Rabbinical writers are accustomed to introduce doxologies into the middle of a sentence, see Schoettgen's *Horae Hebraicae* on 2 Cor. xi. 31.

he Father through him." These facts appear to me to strengthen he presumption founded on the usage of εὐλογητός, that in this pas- age of ambiguous construction the doxological words should be re- erred to God rather than to Christ.

It may be of some interest to observe that in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, probably the earliest Christian writing hat has come down to us outside of the New Testament, there are eight doxologies to God, namely cc. 32, 38, 43, 45, 58, 61, 64, 65, nd none that clearly belong to Christ. Two are ambiguous, viz. cc. 20, 50, like Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11, which a majority of the best commentators refer to God as the leading subject; see above, p. 46. The clear cases of doxologies to Christ in the N. T. are Rev. i. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 18 (a book of doubtful genuineness); and Rev. v. 13, "to Him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb;" comp. vii. 10. But our concern is chiefly with the usage of Paul.

The argument from the exclusive use of the word εὐλογητός in ref- erence to God has been answered by saying that εὐλογητός is also applied to man; and Deut. vii. 14; Ruth ii. 20; and 1 Sam. xv. 13 are cited as examples of this by Dr. Gifford. But he overlooks the fact that εὐλογητός is there used in a totally different sense, viz. 'favored" or "blessed" by God. To speak of a person as "bles- ed" by God, or to pray that he may be so, and to address a doxology o him, are very different things.

Note further that εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 26, applied to Christ in Matt. xxi. 9 and the parallel pas- ages, is not a doxology; comp. Mark xi. 10; Luke i. 28, 42.

On the distinction between εὐλογητός and εὐλογημένος see Note B, t the end of this article.

2. The most striking parallel to ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων in the writings of Paul is in Eph. iv. 5, 9, where Christians are said to have "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one *God* and Father of all, *who is over all* (ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων), and through all, and in all." Here it is used of he one *God*, expressly distinguished from Christ.

3. The Apostle's use of the word θεός, "God," throughout his Epistles. This word occurs in the Pauline Epistles, not including hat to the Hebrews, more than 500 times; and there is not a single clear instance in which it is applied to Christ. Alford, and many other Trinitarian commentators of the highest character, find no instance except the present. Now, in a case of ambiguous construc- ion, ought not this *uniform* usage of the Apostle in respect to one of he most common words to have great weight? To me it is abso- utely decisive.

It may be said, however, that Paul has nowhere declared th Christ is *not* God; and that even if he has not happened to give hi this title in any other passage he must have believed him to be Go and therefore might have so designated him if occasion required.

As to the statement that Paul has nowhere expressly affirmed th Christ was *not* God, it does not appear that, supposing him to ha believed this, he ever had occasion to say it. It is certainly a remar able fact that, whatever may have been the teaching of Paul concer ing the nature of Christ and the mode of his union with God, appears, so far as we can judge from his writings, to have raised r question as to whether he was or was not God; jealous as the Je were of the Divine unity, and disposed as the Gentiles were to reco nize many Gods beside the Supreme.

It is important to observe, in general, that in respect to the appl cation to Christ of the *name* "God," there is a very wide differenc between the usage not only of Paul, but of all the New Testame writers, and that which we find in Christian writers of the second ar later centuries. There is no clear instance, in which any New Test ment *writer*, speaking in his own person, has called Christ Go In John i. 18 the text is doubtful; and in 1 John v. 20 the οὗτος mo naturally refers to the leading subject in what precedes, namely, τ ἀληθινόν, and is so understood by the best grammarians, as Winer ar Buttmann, and by many eminent Trinitarian commentators (s above, p. 19). In John i. 1 θεός is the predicate not of the histo ical Christ, but of the antemundane Logos. The passages whic have been alleged from the writings of Paul will be noticed pre ently.*

But it may be said that even if there is no other passage which Paul has called Christ God, there are many in which the wor and the attributes of God are ascribed to him, and in which he recognized as the object of divine worship; so that we ought to fin no difficulty in supposing that he is here declared to be "God blesse for ever." It may be said in reply, that the passages referred to do n authorize the inference which has been drawn from them; and that they are regarded as doing so, the unity of God would seem to b infringed. A discussion of this subject would lead us out of the fie of exegesis into the tangled thicket of dogmatic theology; we shou

---

*On John xx. 28 and Heb. i. 8, 9, which do not belong to the catego we are now considering, I simply refer, for the sake of brevity, Norton's *Statement of Reasons*, &c., new edition (1856), p. 300 ff., ar the note of E. A., or to the note of Lücke on the former passage, and Prof. Stuart on the latter.

ıave to consider the questions of consubstantiality, eternal generation, he hypostatic union, and the *kenosis*. Such a discussion would here ›e out of place. But it is certainly proper to look at the passages vhere Paul has used the clearest and strongest language concerning he dignity of Christ and his relation to the Father, and ask ourselves vhether they allow us to regard it as probable that he has here spoken ›f him as "God over all, blessed for ever," or even as "over all, God ›lessed for ever."

In the Epistles which purport to be written by Paul there is only ›ne passage besides the present in which any considerable number of ·espectable scholars now suppose that he has actually called Christ *God*, namely, Titus ii. 13. Here the new Revised Version, in the ext, makes him speak of "our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." 3ut the uncertainty of this translation is indicated by the marginal endering, "the great God and our Saviour"; and in a former paper . have stated my reasons for believing the latter construction the true ›ne. (See above, p. 3 ff.) This latter construction was preferred by . large majority of the American Company of Revisers, and it has the upport of many other eminent Trinitarian scholars. Surely so loubtful a passage cannot serve to render it probable that Christ is :alled "God blessed for ever" in Rom. ix. 5.

Acts xx. 28 has also been cited, where, according to the *textus ·eceptus*, Paul, in his address to the Ephesian elders, is represented ıs speaking of "the Church of God, which he purchased with his ›wn blood." This reading is adopted by the English Revisers, in heir text, and also by Scrivener, Alford, and Westcott and Hort; ›ut its doubtfulness is indicated by the marginal note against the word "God," in which the Revisers say, "Many ancient authorities read *'he Lord.*" Here again the marginal reading is preferred by the American Revisers, as also by Lachmann, Tregelles, Green, David-ıon and Tischendorf. I have given my reasons for believing this the ·rue reading in an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1876, pp. 313–352. And although Westcott and Hort adopt the reading *God*, Dr. Hort well remarks that "the supposition that by the precise des-ignation τοῦ θεοῦ, standing alone as it does here, with the article and without any adjunct, St. Paul (or St. Luke) meant Christ, is unsup-›orted by any analogies of language." Calling attention to the fact :hat the true text has the remarkable form διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου, ıe would understand the passage, "on the supposition that the text s incorrupt," as speaking of the Church of God which he purchased "'through the blood that was His own,' *i. e.* as being his Son's." "This conception," he remarks, "of the death of Christ as a price

paid by the Father is in strict accordance with St. Paul's own languag elsewhere (Rom. v. 8; viii. 32). It finds repeated expression in th Apostolic Constitutions in language evidently founded on this passag (ii. 57. 13; 61. 4; vii. 26. 1; viii. [11. 2.] 12. 18; 41. 4)." On the sup position that *θεοῦ* is the true reading, the passage has been understoo in a similar manner not merely by Socinian interpreters, as Wolzoge and Enjedinus, but by Erasmus (in his *Paraphrase*), Pellican,* Lin borch (though he prefers the reading *κυρίου*), Milton (*De Doctrin Christiana*, Pars I. c. v. p. 86, or Eng. trans. p. 148 f.), Lenfant an Beausobre as an alternative interpretation (*Le Nouveau Test.*, note *loc.*), Doederlein (*Inst. Theol. Christ.* ed. 6ta, 1797, § 105, Obs. 4, 387), Van der Palm (note in his Dutch translation), Granville Pen (*The Book of the New Covenant*, London, 1836, and *Annotations*, 183 p. 315), and Mr. Darby (*Trans. of the N. T.*, 2d ed. [1872]). D Hort however is disposed to conjecture that *ΥΙΟΥ* dropped out aft *ΤΟΥΙΔΙΟΥ* "at some very early transcription, affecting all existin documents." Granville Penn had before made the same suggestio It is obvious that no argument in support of any particular co struction of Rom. ix. 5 can be prudently drawn from such a passag as this.

A few other passages in which some scholars still suppose that th name *God* is given to Christ by Paul have been examined in the pap on Titus ii. 13; see above, notes to pp. 3, 10, also p. 44.

Let us now look at the passages in which Paul has used the mo exalted language respecting the person and dignity of Christ, and as ourselves how far they afford a presumption that he might here d scribe him as "God blessed for ever."

The passage in this Epistle most similar to the present is ch. i. ve 3, 4, where Christ is said to be "born of the seed of David as to th flesh," but "declared to be the Son of God with power as to th spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead," or more exactl "by the resurrection of the dead." Here the antithesis to *κατὰ σάρ* is supplied. It is not, however, *κατὰ τὴν θεότητα*, or *κατὰ τὴν θεί φύσιν*, but *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*, "as to his holy spirit,"—his high spiritual nature, distinguished especially by the characteristic of *holines* There are many nice and difficult questions connected with this pa sage, which need not be here discussed; I will only say that I see n ground for finding in it a presumption that the Apostle would desi

---

*"Erga congregationem dei quae vobis oscitanter curanda non es ut quam deus adeò charam habuit, ut unigeniti sui sanguine eam par verit." *Comm.* in loc., Tiguri, 1537, fol.

.e Christ as "God blessed for ever." Some, however, suppose that : title "Son of God" is essentially equivalent to *θεός*, and that the urrection of Christ as an act of his own divine power is adduced re as a proof of his deity. I do not find the first supposition sup- rted by the use of the term in the Old Testament or in the New e John x. 36), and as to the second, it may be enough to say that contradicts the uniform representation of the Apostle Paul on the bject, who everywhere refers his resurrection to the power of "God, e Father"; see Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 19, 20; Rom. iv. 24; vi. 4; viii. ; x. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 14; xv. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 14; xiii. 4; 1 Thes. i. 10; :ts xiii. 30–37; xvii. 31.

Another striking passage is Phil. ii. 6–11, where the Apostle says at Christ, "existing in the form of God, counted not the being on equality with God* a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, king the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men." ithout entering into any detailed discussion of this passage, it may enough to remark that being in the form of God, as Paul uses the pression here, is a very different thing from being God; that the *μορφή* cannot denote the nature or essence of Christ, because it is mething of which he is represented as emptying or divesting him- lf. The same is true of the *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*, "the being on an uality with God," or "like God," which is spoken of as something hich he was not eager to *seize*, according to one way of under- nding *ἁρπαγμόν*, or not eager to *retain*, according to another inter- etation.† The Apostle goes on to say that on account of this lf-abnegation and his obedience even unto death "God *highly alted* him and *gave* him the name which is above every name; that the name of Jesus every knee should bow . . . and that every ngue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God, e Father." I cannot think that this passage, distinguishing Christ it does so clearly from God, and representing his present exaltation a reward bestowed upon him by God, renders it at all likely that ul would call him "God blessed for ever."

We find a still more remarkable passage in the Epistle to the Col- sians, i. 15–20, where it is affirmed concerning the Son that "he

---

* Or, as the Rev. Dr. B. H. Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek in e University of Cambridge, translates it, "the being like God"; com- re Whitby's note on the use of *ἴσα*. See Kennedy's *Occasional Ser- ons preached before the University of Cambridge*, London, 1877, p. , or *Ely Lectures* (1882), p. 17 f.

† See Grimm's *Lexicon Novi Testamenti*, ed. 2da (1879), s. v. *μορφή*, one view; for another, Weiss's *Biblische Theol. des N. T.*, § 103 c, 432 ff., 3te Aufl. (1880).

is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him were all things created, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist [*or* hold together]. And he is the head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence [more literally, "*become* first"]. For it was the good pleasure [of the Father] that in him should all the fulness dwell; and through him to reconcile all things unto himself." In this passage, and in Col. ii. 9, 10, where the Apostle says of Christ "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and in him are ye made full, who is the head of all principality and power," we find, I believe, the strongest language which Paul has anywhere used concerning Christ's position in the universe, and his relation to the Church. I waive all question of the genuineness of the Epistle. Does then the language here used render it probable that Paul would, on occasion, designate Christ as "over all, God blessed for ever"?

Here certainly, if anywhere, we might expect that he would call him God; but he has not only not done so, but has carefully distinguished him from the being for whom he seems to reserve that name. He does not call him God, but "the *image* of the invisible God," (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4, and 1 Cor. xi. 7). His agency in the work of creation is also restricted and made secondary by the use of the prepositions ἐν and διά, clearly indicating that the conception in the mind of the Apostle is the same which appears in the Epistle to the Hebrews, i. 3; that he is not the primary source of the power exerted in creation, but the being "*through* whom God *made* the worlds," δι' οὗ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας; comp. also 1 Cor. viii. 6, Eph. iii. 9 (though here διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is not genuine), and the well-known language of Philo concerning the Logos.* Neither Paul nor any

* Philo calls the Logos the "Son of God," "the eldest son," "the first-begotten," and his representation of his agency in creation is very similar to that which Paul here attributes to "the Son of God's love" (ver. 13). He describes the Logos as "the *image* of God, *through* whom the whole world was framed," εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κ. τ. λ. (*De Monarch.* ii. 5, Opp. ii. 225 ed. Mangey); "the instrument, through which [or whom] the world was built," ὄργανον δι' οὗ κ. τ. λ. (*De Cherub.* c. 35, Opp. i. 162, where note Philo's distinction between τὸ ὑφ' οὗ, τὸ ἐξ οὗ, τὸ δι' οὗ, and τὸ δι' ὅ); "the shadow of God, using whom as an instrument he made the world" (*Legg. Alleg.* iii. 31, Opp. i. 106). In two or three places he exceptionally applies the term θεός to the Logos, professedly using it in a lower sense (ἐν καταχρήσει), and making a distinction between θεός, without the article, "*a* divine being," and ὁ θεός, "*the*

her New Testament writer uses the preposition ὑπό, "by," in speaking of the agency of the Son or Logos in creation. The designation "firstborn of all creation" seems also a very strange one to be applied to Christ conceived of as God. Some of the most orthodox Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, as Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Augustine, were so perplexed by it that they understood the Apostle to be speaking here of the new, spiritual creation;* and the passage has been explained as relating to this by some eminent modern interpreters, as Grotius, Wetstein, Ernesti, Noesselt, Heinrichs, Schleiermacher, Baumgarten-Crusius, Norton, though, I believe, erroneously. But I shall not discuss here the meaning of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. I would only call attention to the way in which the Apostle speaks of the *good pleasure* of God, the Father, as the *source* of Christ's fulness of gifts and powers. "For it was the good pleasure [of God] that in him should all the fulness dwell" (ver. 19).† This declaration explains also Col. ii. 9; compare Eph. iii. 19; iv. 13; John i. 16. See also John xiv. 10; iii. 34(?).

It thus appears, I think, first, that there is no satisfactory evidence that Paul has elsewhere called Christ *God;* and secondly, that in the passages in which he speaks of his dignity and power in the most exalted language, he not only seems studiously to avoid giving him this appellation, but represents him as *deriving* his dignity and power from the being to whom, in distinction from Christ, he everywhere gives that name,—the "one God, the Father."

---

divine Being." (See *De Somn.* i. 38, Opp. i. 655, and comp. *Legg. Alleg.* iii. 73, Opp. i. 128, l. 43.) In a fragment preserved by Eusebius (*Praep. Evang.* vii. 13, or Philonis *Opp.* ii. 625) he names the Logos ὁ δεύτερος θεός, "the second [*or* inferior] God," distinguished from "the Most High and Father of the universe," "the God who is before [*or* above, ὁ] the Logos." So he applies the term to Moses (comp. Exod. vii. 1,) and says that it may be used of one who "procures good (τὸ ἀγαθὸν) for others," and is "wise." *De Mut. Nom.* c. 22, Opp. i. 597, 598; see also *De Mos.* i. 28, Opp. ii. 106 [misprinted 108], where Moses is called θεοῦ τοῦ ἔθνους θεὸς καὶ βασιλεύς; *Quod det. pot. insid.* c. 44, Opp. i. 212; *De Migr. Abr.* c. 15, Opp. i. 449; *Legg. Alleg.* i. 13, Opp. i. 151; *Quod omn. prob. liber*, c. 7, Opp. ii. 452; *De Decem. Orac.* c. 23, Opp. ii. 201. But though he speaks of the Logos in language as exalted as Paul uses concerning the Son, he would never have dreamed of calling him ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλόγητος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

*See Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, p. 214 ff.

†ὁ θεός (or ὁ πατήρ) must be supplied as the subject of εὐδόκησεν; comp. ver. 20, and Lightfoot's note. So Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Eadie, and the great majority of expositors.

We have considered the strongest passages which have been adduce to justify the supposition that Paul *might* apply this title to Chris I have already intimated that they do not seem to me to authoriz this supposition. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that w must infer from these and other passages that he really held the do trine of the consubstantiality and co-eternity of the Son with th Father, and that on this account he would have been *justified* in cal ing him God, this does not remove the great improbability that h *has* so designated him, incidentally, in Rom. ix. 5, in opposition t a usage of the term which pervades all his writings. The questio still forces itself upon us, What was the ground of this usage? *Wh* has he elsewhere avoided giving him this title? In answering th question here, wishing to avoid as far as possible all dogmat discussion, and to confine myself to exegetical consideration I shall not transgress the limits of recognized orthodoxy. Th doctrine of the *subordination* of the Son to the Father, in h divine as well as his human nature, has been held by a very larg number, and if I mistake not, by a majority, of professed believe in the deity of Christ. The fourth and last Division or "Section of Bishop Bull's famous *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae* is entitled *De Subo dinatione Filii ad Patrem, ut ad sui originem ac principium.* He mai tains and proves that the Fathers who lived before and many, at leas of those who lived after the Council of Nice unequivocally acknow edged this subordination (though the post-Nicene writers were mo guarded in their language), and that on this account, while callin the Son *Θεός*, and *Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ*, as begotten from the substance of th Father, they were accustomed to reserve such titles as *ὁ Θεός* use absolutely, *εἷς Θεός*, and *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων* or *ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεός* for the Fath alone. The Father alone was "uncaused," "unoriginated," "th fountain of deity" to the Son and Spirit.* Now the word *Θε* was often used by the Fathers of the second and later centuries n as a proper, but as a common name; angels, and even Christian especially in their beatified state, might be and were called *Θεοί.* had also a metaphorical and rhetorical use, quite foreign from th style of the New Testament.† All this made it easy and natura

* "The ancient doctors of the church," as Bishop Pearson remark "have not stuck to call the Father 'the origin, the cause, the author, th root, the fountain, and the head of the Son,' or the whole Divinity *Exposition of the Creed*, Chap. I. p. 38, Nichols's ed.

†For proof and illustration of what has been stated, see Norton's *Ge uineness of the Gospels*, 2d ed., vol. iii. Addit. Note D, "On the Use the Words *Θεός* and *deus*"; *Statement of Reasons*, 12th ed., pp. 113, 11 note, 120 note, 300 f., 314, 319 f., 365 note, 468; Sandius, *Interpretation*

specially for the Fathers who were converts from heathenism, to pply the title in a relative, not absolute, sense to the Son, notwithtanding the pre-eminence which they ascribed to the Father. We ind traces of this loose use of the name in Philo, as I have observed see p. 118, note). But there is no trace of such a use in the writings of Paul.—The points, then, which I would make are these: that even granting that he believed in the deity of the Son as set forth in the Nicene Creed, he yet held the doctrine of the *subordination* of the Son so trongly in connection with it, that we cannot wonder if *on this account* he reserved the title θεός exclusively for the Father; and that he way in which he has expressed this subordination, and the way n which he has used this title, render it incredible that he should in his single instance (Rom. ix. 5) have suddenly transferred it to Christ, with the addition of another designation, "blessed for ever," elsewhere used by him of the Father alone.

I do not see how any one can read the Epistles of Paul without perceiving that, in speaking of the objects of Christian faith, he contantly uses θεός as a *proper name*, as the designation of the Father in distinction from Christ. See, for example, Rom. i. 1 3, "the gospel of *God*, which he had before promised . . . concerning his Son"; ver. 7, "*God* our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ"; ver. 8, "I thank my *God*, through Jesus Christ"; ver. 9, "*God* is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit in the gospel of his Son"; and so all through the Epistle;—2 Cor. v. 18, 19, "All things are of *God*, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that *God* was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses"; Eph. . 20, "giving thanks always for all things, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to *God*, even the Father;" though among the heathen there are gods many, and lords many (1 Cor. viii. 6) "to us there is *one God*, the Father, from whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him"; Eph. iv. 5, 6, There is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, *one God* and Father of all, *who is over all*, and through all, and in you all"; 1 Tim. ii. 5, "There is *one God*, one mediator also between God and men, [himself] a man, Christ Jesus"; v. 21, "I charge thee before *God*, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels"; Tit.

Paradoxa (1669), p. 227 ff.; Whiston's *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, vol. iv. p. 100 ff.; Le Clerc (Clericus), *Ars Critica*, Pars II. Sect. I. c. II., vol. i. p. 145 ff., 6th ed., 1778; *Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria, by John* [Kaye], *Bp. of Lincoln*, 1835, p. 253.

iii. 4 6, "*God* our Saviour" poured out upon us the Holy Spirit "*through* Jesus Christ our Saviour." Observe how strongly the subordination of the Son is expressed in passages where his dignity and lordship are described in the loftiest strain: Eph. i. 16-23, "—in my prayers, that the *God of our Lord Jesus Christ*, the Father of glory, may give unto you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; . . . that ye may know what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ when *he raised him from the dead*, and *made him to sit at his right hand* in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and *he put all things in subjection under his feet*, and *gave* him to be head over all things to the Church"; 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23, "all things are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is *God's*"; xi. 3, "the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is *God;*" xv. 24, "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to *God*, even the Father; ver. 27, 28, "But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that He is excepted who did subject all things unto him. And when all things have been subjected unto him, THEN shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that *God* may be all in all."

Can we believe that he who has throughout his writings placed Christ in such a relation of *subordination* to the Father, and has habitually used the name God as the peculiar designation of the Father in distinction from Christ, who also calls the Father the one God, the only wise God (Rom. xvi. 27), the only God (1 Tim. i. 17), and the God of Christ, has here, in opposition to the usage elsewhere uniform of a word occurring 500 times, suddenly designated *Christ* as "over all, God blessed for ever"? At least, should not the great improbability of this turn the scale, in a passage of doubtful construction?

4. There is another consideration which seems to me to render it very improbable that Paul has here deviated from his habitual restriction of the name *God* to "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." If he has spoken of Christ in this passage as "God blessed for ever" he has done it *obiter*, as if those whom he addressed were familiar with such a conception and designation of him. But can this have been the case with the Roman church at so early a stage in the development of Christian doctrine?

It is the view of many Trinitarians that the doctrine that Christ is God was not *explicitly* taught in the early preaching of the Apostles. We find no trace of such teaching in the discourses of Peter or of Stephen in the book of Acts, and none in those of the Apostle Paul (the passage Acts xx. 28 has already been examined), as we find none in the Synoptic Gospels, which represent the instruction concerning Christ given by the Apostles and their companions to their converts.* Nor does it appear in the so-called Apostles' Creed. When we consider further the fact already mentioned above (see p. 114) that Christ is nowhere called God in any unambiguous passage by any *writer* of the New Testament,† and that it is nowhere recorded that he ever claimed this title, we cannot reasonably regard this abstinence from the use of the term as accidental. In reference to the early apostolic preaching in particular, many of the Christian Fathers, and later Trinitarian writers, have recognized a prudent reserve in the communication of a doctrine concerning Christ and the application of a title to him which would at once have provoked vehement opposition

---

* "There is nothing in St. Peter's Sermon upon the day of Pentecost, which would not, in all probability, have been acknowledged by every Ebionite Christian down to the time when they finally disappear from history. Yet upon such a statement of doctrine, miserably insufficient as all orthodox churches would now call it, three thousand Jews and proselytes were, without delay, admitted to the Sacrament of Baptism." . . . "We must carefully bear in mind what was St. Peter's object. It was to convince the Jews that Jesus Christ was the great appointed Teacher whom God had sent—the true spiritual Prince whom they were to obey. The Apostle felt that if they acknowledged these great truths, everything else would follow in due time." T. W. Mossman, B. A., Rector of Torrington, *A History of the Cath. Church of Jesus Christ*, etc., Lond. 1873, pp. 192, 190. Gess naïvely asks, "Wie dürfte man von dem galiläischen Fischer, welcher der Wortführer der junger Gemeinde war, eine befriedigende Dogmatik erwarten?" *Christi Person und Werk*, II. i. 13. See also Dr. John Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, Book III. Cap. V. (Vol. II. p. 151, ff., 5th ed.)

†I speak of the historical Christ, which is the subject in Rom. ix. 5. The unique Prologue of John's Gospel, in which the *Logos* or Word is once called *θεός* (i. 1, comp. ver. 18 in the text of Tregelles and Westcott and Hort), cannot reasonably be regarded as parallel to the present passage. This is candidly admitted by Schultz, who has most elaborately defended the construction which refers the last part of Rom. ix. 5 to Christ. He says: "Nach unseren Prämissen versteht sich von selbst, dass wir nicht etwa daraus, dass der *λόγος θεός* genannt wird, Beweise ziehen wollen für die Zulässigkeit des Namens *θεός* für den verklärten Jesus." (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.*, 1868, xiii. 491.) I of course do not enter here into the difficult questions as to what was precisely John's conception of the Logos, and in what sense he says "the Word became flesh," language which no one understands literally. We must consider also the late date of the Gospel of John as compared with the Epistle to the Romans.

on the part of the unbelieving Jews, which would have been particu
larly liable to be misunderstood by the Gentiles, and must have
required much careful explanation to reconcile it with the unity o
God and the humanity of Christ.* We nowhere find either in the
Acts or the Epistles any trace of the controversy and questioning
which the direct announcement of such a doctrine must have excited.
The one aim of the early apostolic preaching was to convince first the
Jews, and then the Gentiles, that Jesus, whose life and teaching were
so wonderful, whom God had raised from the dead, was the Messiah
exalted by God to be a Prince and a Saviour. To acknowledge Jesus
as the Christ, or Jesus as Lord, which is essentially the same thing,
was the one fundamental article of the Christian faith.† Much
indeed, was involved in this confession; but it is now, I suppose,
fully established, and generally admitted, that the Jews in the time o
Christ had no expectation that the coming Messiah would be an
incarnation of Jehovah, and no acquaintance with the mystery of the
Trinity.‡ Such being the state of the case, it seems to me that, on

*For superabundant quotations from the Christian Fathers confirming the statement made above, notwithstanding a few mistakes, see Priestley's *History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ*, Book III. Chap. IV.–VII. (Vol. III. p. 86 ff. ed. of 1786.) Or see Chrysostom's Homilies on the Acts, *passim*. How this doctrine would have struck a Jew, may be seen from Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*.

†See Neander, *Hist. of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles*, Book I. Chap. II. Comp. Matt. xvi. 16; Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20; John vi. 69; xx. 31; Acts ii. 36; v. 42; viii. 5; ix. 20, 22; xvii. 3; xviii. 5, 28; Rom. x. 9, *nota bene*; 1 Cor. xii. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 5; 1 John iv. 2; v. 1.

‡See the art. *Messias*, by Oehler, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie der prot. Theol. und Kirche*, ix. 437 ff., or in the new ed. of Herzog and Plitt, vol. ix. (1881), p. 666 ff.; Ferd. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästin. Theol.* (1880), p. 146 ff., 339 ff.—Passages from the Rabbinical writings are sometimes adduced by commentators on Rom. ix. 5 in which the name Jehovah, or Jehovah our righteousness, is said to be given to the Messiah. But the irrelevance of these citations has been repeatedly exposed; see Fritzsche, *Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 269, note; Weber, *ut supra*, p. 342. Weber says:—"Und wenn *Baba bathra* 75^{b} gesagt wird, der Messias werde nach dem Namen Jehova's יהוה צדקנו genannt, so stehen an dieser Stelle in gleicher Beziehung die Gerechten und Jerusalem." Comp. Jer. xxiii. 6 with xxxiii. 16, and on this passage see Oehler, *Theol. des A. T.*, ii. 263; Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 262, note 36; Schultz, *Alttest. Theol.*, 2te Aufl. (1878), p. 740. On Is. ix. 6 see Schultz, p. 727; Hitzig, *Vorlesungen uber bibl. Theol.*, u. s. w. (1880), p. 206 ff., and the commentators, as Gesenius, Knobel, Ewald, Cheyne. That the *Memra da Yeya* or "Word of Jehovah" is not identified in the Targums with the Messiah is certain; see Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, art. *Word*, vol. iv. p. 3557 b, Amer. ed., and Weber, *ut supra*, p. 339. It is time that the book Zohar, which figures so conspicuously in Schoettgen, Bertholdt, and other writers, but is now proved to be a pseudograph of the thirteenth century, should cease to be quoted as an

he supposition that the Apostles were fully enlightened in regard to he mystery of the Trinity and the hypostatic union, the only tenable ground to be taken is, that they wisely left these doctrines to develop themselves gradually in "the Christian consciousness." As Dr. Pye Smith remarks, "The whole revelation of the Christian system was given by an advancing process. It cannot, therefore be a matter of surprise, that the doctrine concerning the person of the Messiah was developed gradually, and that its clearest manifestation is to be found n the latest written books of the New Testament." (*Ut supra*, p. 155.) Canon Westcott observes, "The study of the Synoptists, of he Apocalypse and of the Gospel of St. John in succession enables us to see under what human conditions the full majesty of Christ was perceived and declared, not all at once, but step by step, and by the help of the old prophetic teaching." (*Introd. to the Gospel of St. John*, in the so-called "Speaker's Commentary," p. lxxxvii.) Canon Kennedy even says:—"I do not think that any apostle, John, or Peter, or Paul, was so taught the full *μυστήριον θεότητος* as that they were prepared to formulate the decrees of Nicæa and Constantinople, which appeared after 300 years and more, or the Trinitarian exegesis, which was completed after 600 years and more. But they, with the other evangelists, guided by the Holy Spirit, furnished the materials from which those doctrines were developed." (*Ely Lectures*, p. xix.)

Taking all these facts into consideration, is it probable that at this early day the Jewish Christians and Gentile believers at Rome, who needed so much instruction in the very elements of Christianity, were already so fully initiated into the mysterious doctrine of the deity of Christ, that the application of the term God to him, found in no Christian writing that we know of till long after the date of this Epistle, could have been familiar to them? Accustomed to the representation of him as a being distinct from God, would they not have been startled and amazed beyond measure by finding him described as "over all, God blessed for ever"?—But if so, if this was a doctrine and a use of language with which they were not familiar, it is to me wholly incredible that the Apostle should have introduced it abruptly in this incidental manner, and have left it without remark or explanation.

Dr. Hermann Schultz, whose elaborate dissertation on Rom. ix. 5 has been already referred to, admits that if *ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* was used

---

authority for Jewish opinions in the time of Christ. See Ginsburg, *The Kabbalah* (Lond. 1865), p. 78 ff., espec. p. 90 ff.—One who is disposed to rely on Hengstenberg's *Christology* in relation to this subject, should compare the review of it by Dr. Noyes in the *Christian Examiner* (Boston) for Jan., May, and July, 1836.

here to designate the λόγος, the eternal Son of God, in other words, if θεός was used here in reference to the nature of Christ, "the strict monotheism of Paul would certainly require an intimation that the honor due to God alone was not here trenched upon" (*beeinträchtigt*).* The expression, he maintains, describes "the dignity conferred upon him by God"; the θεός here is essentially equivalent to κύριος. "The predicate θεός must be perfectly covered by the subject Χριστός, i. e. the Messianic human King of Israel."†

But these concessions of Schultz seem to me fatal to his construction of the passage. If θεός used in the metaphysical sense, describing the *nature* of Christ, would confessedly need explanation, to guard against an apparent infringement of the Divine unity, would not Paul's readers need to be cautioned against taking it in this sense, the sense which it has everywhere else in his writings?—Again, if Paul by θεός here only meant κύριος, why did he not say κύριος, this being his constant designation of the glorified Christ (comp. Phil. ii. 9–11)?

This leads me to notice further the important passage 1 Cor. viii. 6, already quoted (see above, p. 121). It has often been said that the mention here of the Father as the "one God" of Christians no more excludes Christ from being God and from receiving this name, than the designation of Christ as the "one Lord" excludes the Father from being Lord and receiving this name. But in making this statement some important considerations are overlooked. In the first

---

*Schultz, *Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theol.*, 1868, xiii. 484.

†This view of Schultz appears to be that of Hofmann (*Der Schriftbeweis*, 2te Aufl., 1857, i. 143) and Weiss (*Bibl. Theol. d. N. T.*, 3te Aufl., 1880, p. 283, note 5), as it was formerly of Ritschl (*Die Entstehung der altkath. Kirche*, 2te Aufl., 1857, p. 79, f.). This is the way also in which the old Socinian commentators understood the passage, as Socinus, Crell, Schlichting, Wolzogen. They did not hesitate to give the name "God" to Christ, any more than the ancient Arians did, understanding it in a lower sense, and referring especially in justification of this to John x. 34–36, and various passages of the Old Testament. So it appears to have been taken by some of the Ante-Nicene Fathers who referred the last clause of the verse to Christ, as probably by Novatian, who quotes the passage twice as proof that Christ is *Deus* (*De Regula Fidei* or *De Trin.* cc. 13, 30), but who says "Dominus et Deus *constitutus* esse reperitur" (c. 20); "hoc ipsum *a Patre proprio consecutus* ut omnium et Deus esset et Dominus esset" (c. 22); "omnium Deus quoniam omnibus illum *Deus Pater praeposuit* quem genuit" (c. 31). So Hippolytus (*Cont. Noët.* c. 6) applies the verse to Christ, and justifies the language by quoting Christ's declaration, "All things have been delivered to me by the Father." He cites other passages in the same connection, and says: "If then all things have been subjected unto him with the exception of Him who subjected them, he rules over all, *but the Father rules over him.*"

place, the title "god" is unquestionably of far higher dignity than the title "lord"; and because godship *includes* lordship with all the titles that belong to it, it by no means follows that lordship includes godship and has a right to its titles; in other words, that one who is properly called a *lord* (κύριος), as having servants or subjects or possessions, may therefore be properly called a *god* (θεός). In the second place, the lordship of Christ is everywhere represented not as belonging to him by *nature*, but as conferred upon him by the one God and Father of all. This lordship is frequently denoted by the figurative expression, "sitting on the right hand of God."* The expression is borrowed from Ps. cx., so often cited in the New Testament as applicable to Christ, and particularly by Peter in his discourse on the day of Pentecost, who, after quoting the words, "The Lord [*Jehovah*] said unto my Lord [*Adoni*], 'Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool,'" goes on to say, "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath MADE him both *Lord* and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified" (Acts ii. 35, 36). It is he to whom "all authority was *given* in heaven and on earth," whom "*God exalted* with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour"; "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . *put all things in subjection* under his feet, and *gave* him to be head over all things to the Church"; "*gave* unto him the name which is above every name . . . that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is *Lord*, to the glory of God, the Father." Such being Paul's conception of the relation of Christ to God, is it not the plain meaning of the passage, that while the heathen worship and serve many beings whom they call "gods" and "lords," to Christians there is but one God, the Father,—one being to whom they give that name, "from whom are all things," and who is the subject of supreme worship; and one being "through whom are all things," through whom especially flow our spiritual blessings, whom "God hath made both Lord and Christ, and whom Christians therefore habitually call "the Lord." The fact that this appellation of Christ, under such circumstances, does not debar the Supreme Being from receiving the name "Lord," obviously affords no countenance to the notion that Paul would not hesitate to give to Christ the name "God." As a matter of fact "the Lord" is the common designation of Christ in the writings of Paul, and is seldom used of God, except in quotations from or references to the

---

*See Knapp, *De Jesu Christo ad dextram Dei sedente*, in his *Scripta varii Argumenti*, ed. 2da (1823), i. 39–76.

language of the Old Testament.* There, in the Septuagint, Κύριος is used of God sometimes as a proper name, taking the place of Jehovah (Yahweh), on account of a Jewish superstition, and sometimes as an appellative.

Glancing back now, for a moment, over the field we have traversed, we may reasonably say, it seems to me, *first*, that the use of εὐλογητός, elsewhere in the New Testament restricted to God, the Father,—in connection with the exceeding rarity, if not absence, of ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving to Christ in the writings of Paul, and their frequency in reference to God,—affords a pretty strong presumption in favor of that construction of this ambiguous passage which makes the last clause a doxology to the Father; *secondly*, that some additional confirmation is given to this reference by the εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, in Eph. iv. 6; and *thirdly*, that the at first view overwhelming presumption in favor of this construction, founded on the uniform restriction of the designation θεός, occurring more than five hundred times, to God, the Father, in the writings of Paul, is not weakened, but rather strengthened, by our examination of the language which he elsewhere uses respecting the dignity of Christ and his relation to God. And though our sources of information are imperfect, we have seen that there are very grave reasons for doubting whether the use of θεός as a designation of Christ belonged to the language of Christians anywhere, at so early a period as the date of this Epistle (cir. A. D. 58).

Beyond a doubt, all the writers of the New Testament, and the early preachers of Christianity, believed that God was *united with* the man Jesus Christ in a way unique and peculiar, distinguishing him from all other beings; that his teaching and works and character were divine; that God had raised him from the dead, and exalted him to be a Prince and a Saviour; that he came, as the messenger of God's love and mercy, to redeem men from sin, and make them truly sons of God; that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." But no New Testament writer has *defined the mode* of this union with God. How much real light has been thrown upon the subject by the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, and the so-called Athanasian Creed, is a question on which there may be differences of opinion. The *authority* of councils is another question. But it has been no part of my object in

* "On the meaning of ΚΥΡΙΟΣ in the New Testament, particularly on the manner in which this word is employed by Paul in his Epistles," see the valuable article of Prof. Stuart in the *Biblical Repository* (Andover) for Oct. 1831, i. 733-776. His view is that the κυριότης which Christ has as the Messiah is a delegated dominion.

discussing the construction of the passage before us, to argue against the doctrine of the Nicene Creed; my point is simply the *use of language* at the time when this Epistle was written. The questions of doctrine and language are of course closely connected, but are not identical. It seems to me that a believer in the deity of Christ, admitting the fact that we have no clear evidence that the "mediator between God and men" was ever *called* "God" by any New Testament writer, or any very early preacher of Christianity, may recognize therein a wise providence which saved the nascent Church from controversies and discussions for which it was not then prepared.

III. We will now consider some other constructions of the passage before us. (See above, p. 89 f.)

1. I refrain from discussing in detail the comparative merits of Nos. 1 and 2. The advocates of No. 1 observe, correctly, that it describes Christ as only ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, not ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, which they say would identify him with the Father. But if the Father is "God over all," and Christ is also "God over all," the question naturally arises, how the Father can be "*the* God over all," unless the term "God" as applied to Christ is used in a lower sense. The answers to this question would lead us beyond the sphere of exegesis, and I pass it by. Meyer thinks that if we refer the ὁ ὤν to Christ this is the most natural construction of the words, and it seems to have been adopted by most of the ancient Fathers who have cited the passage, at least after the Council of Nicæa, and in nearly all the generally received modern translations, from Luther and Tyndale downwards.

2. Construction No. 2 aims to escape the difficulty presented by No. 1, but involves some ambiguities. Does the sentence mean, "who is over all (Jews as well as Gentiles), and who is also God blessed for ever" (so Hofmann, Kahnis, *Die luth. Dogm.* i. 453 f.)? or does it mean "celui qui est élevé sur toutes choses, comme Dieu béni éternellement"? as Godet translates it (*Comm.* ii. 256), contending that ἐπὶ πάντων is not to be connected with θεός, but with ὤν, though he had before translated, inconsistently it would seem, "lui qui est Dieu au-dessus de toutes choses béni éternellement" (pp. 248, 254). Lange finds in the last clause "a quotation from the synagogical liturgy," together with "a strong Pauline breviloquence," the ellipsis in which he supplies in a manner that must always hold a high place among the curiosities of exegesis. He says, however, that "every exposition is attended with great difficulties." I cannot discover that "God blessed for ever" as a kind of compound name of the Supreme Being occurs in Jewish liturgies or anywhere else.

3. Construction No. 3 is defended particularly by Gess, who maintains in opposition to Schultz and others that *θεός* here "nicht Christi Machtstellung sondern seine Wesenheit bezeichnet." (*Christi Person und Werk*, II. i. 207.) But on this supposition he admits that the connecting of *θεός* with *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων* would present a serious difficulty. "The care with which Paul elsewhere chooses his expressions in such a way that the supreme majesty of the Father shines forth would be given up." Meyer thinks that the punctuation adopted by Morus and Gess makes "die Rede" "noch zerstückter, ja kurzathmiger" than construction No. 5. But this is rather a matter of taste and feeling. The objections which seem to me fatal to all the constructions which refer the name *θεός* here to Christ have been set forth above, and need not be repeated.

If the view of Westcott and Hort is correct, the construction of this passage adopted by Hippolytus (*Cont. Noët.* c. 6) agrees with that of Gess in finding three distinct affirmations in the clause beginning with *ὁ ὤν*, in opposition to those who would read it *μονοκώλως*. But the passage in Hippolytus is obscure. See below, under IV.

4. Under No. 4 I have noticed a possible construction, for which, as regards the essential point, I have referred to Wordsworth's note, in his *N. T. in Greek*, new ed., vol. ii. (1864). He translates, in his note on ver. 5: "He that is existing above all, God Blessed for ever," and remarks: "There is a special emphasis on *ὁ ὤν*. He that *is*; He Who is the *being One*; JEHOVAH. See John i. 18; Rev. i. 4, 8; iv. 8; xi. 17; xvi. 5, compared with Exod. iii. 14, *ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ ὤν*. And compare on Gal. iii. 20." . . . "He Who *came* of the Jews, according to the *flesh*, is no other than *ὁ ὤν*, the BEING ONE, JEHOVAH." . . . We have an assertion of "His *Existence* from Everlasting, in *ὁ ὤν*." He mistranslates the last part of Athanasius, *Orat. cont. Arian.* i. § 24, p. 338, thus: "*Paul* asserts that He is the splendour of His Father's Glory, and is the Being One, over all, God Blessed for ever." In his note on ver. 4, 5, on the other hand, he translates the present passage: "Christ came, Who is over all, God Blessed for ever."

There is some confusion here. The verb *εἰμί* may denote simple existence; it may (in contrasts) denote *real* in distinction from *seeming* existence; it may be, and commonly is, used as a mere copula, connecting the subject with the predicate. As applied to the Supreme Being in Exod. iii. 14 (Sept.), Wisd. Sol. xiii. 1, etc., *ὁ ὤν*, "He who Is," describes him as possessing not only real, but independent and hence eternal existence. This latter use is altogether peculiar. To find it where *ὤν* is used as a *copula*, or to suppose that the two

ses can be combined, is purely fanciful and arbitrary. It was not
o fanciful and arbitrary, however, for some of the Christian Fathers,
ho argue Christ's eternal existence from the use of ὢν or ὁ ὤν (or
i est) in such passages as John i. 18; iii. 13 (t. r.); vi. 46; Rom.
. 5; Heb. i. 3. So Athanasius, as above; Epiphanius, *Ancorat.* c.
; Gregory of Nyssa, *Adv. Eunom.* lib. x., Opp. (1638) ii. 680–82;
seudo-Basil, *Adv. Eunom.* iv. 2, Opp. i. 282 (399); Chrysostom,
pp. 1. 476 f., viii. 87, ed. Montf.; Hilary, *De Trin.* xii. 24. So
roclus of Constantinople, *Ep. ad Armen. de Fide* c. 14, quoting
om. ix. 5, says: εἶπεν αὐτὸν ὄντα, ἵνα ἄναρχον βροντήσῃ; "he spoke
f him as *being*, that he might declare in thunder his existence with-
ut beginning." (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* lxv. 872c.)

5. The construction, "from whom is the Messiah as to the flesh,
e who is over all: God be blessed for ever!", has found favor with
me eminent scholars (see below under IV.), and deserves conside-
tion. If adopted, I think we should understand ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων
ot as meaning "he who is superior to all the patriarchs" (Justi and
thers), which is tame, and would hardly be expressed in this way;
or "he who is over all things," which, without qualification, seems
o absolute for Paul; but rather, "who is Lord of *all* (Jews and
entiles alike), comp. Acts x. 36; Rom. x. 12; xi. 32; who, though
e sprang from the Jews, is yet, as the Messiah, the ruler of a king-
om which embraces all men. (See Wetstein's note, near the end.)
he natural contrast suggested by the mention of Christ's relation to
ie Jews κατὰ σάρκα, may justify us in assuming this reference of
άντων, which also accords with the central thought of the Epistle.
he doxology, however, seems exceedingly abrupt and curt; and we
ould expect ὁ θεός instead of θεός as the subject of the sentence,
ough in a few cases the word stands in the nominative without the
rticle. Grimm compares θεὸς μάρτυς, 1 Thess. ii. 5, with μάρτυς ὁ
εός, Rom. i. 9; also 2 Cor. v. 19; Gal. ii. 6; vi. 7; Luke xx. 38 (?).
Ve should also rather expect εὐλογητός to stand first in the doxology;
ut the position of words in Greek is so largely subjective, depending
n the feeling of the writer, that we cannot urge this objection very
rongly. The thought, so frequent in Paul, of God as the *source*, in
ontrast with, or rather in distinction from, Christ as the *medium* of
ie Messianic blessings, may have given the word θεός prominence.
See above, p. 108 f., in regard to the position of the subject in con-
asts.) Gess accordingly dismisses the objection founded on the
osition of εὐλογητός, remarking, "die Voranstellung von θεός hätte
urch den Gegensatz gegen Christum ein zureichendes Motiv" (*ubi*

supra, p. 206). Still, on the whole, construction No. 7 seems to me much easier and more natural.

6. The construction numbered 6 was, I believe, first proposed by Professor Andrews Norton, in his review of Prof. Stuart's *Letters to Dr Channing*. This was published in the *Christian Disciple* (Boston) for 1819, new series, vol. i. p. 370 ff.; on Rom. ix. 5 see p. 418 ff. The passage is discussed more fully in his *Statement of Reasons*, &c. Cambridge and Boston, 1833, p. 147 ff.; new ed. (ster. 1856), p. 120 ff. 470 ff., in which some notes were added by the writer of the present essay. There, after giving as the literal rendering, "He who was over all was God, blessed for ever," Mr. Norton remarks: "'He who was over all,' that is, over all which has just been mentioned by the Apostle." . . . "Among the privileges and distinctions of the Jews, it could not be forgotten by the Apostle, that God had presided over all their concerns in a particular manner."

There is no grammatical objection to this construction of the passage. (See above, p. 99, 1st paragr.) Mr. Norton, in translating ver. 4 and 5, uses the *past* tense in supplying the ellipsis of the substantive verb. This is done by other translators, e. g. Conybeare and Howson. It may be questioned, however, whether this is fully justified here. Canon Kennedy uses the present tense, but seems to take the same general view of the bearing of the passage as Mr Norton. See his *Occasional Sermons*, pp. 64, 65, and *Ely Lectures* pp. 88, 89.

As regards this view of the passage, I will only say here, that the thought presented in Mr. Norton's translation did not need to be expressed, as it is fully implied in the nature of the privileges and distinctions enumerated. (See above, p. 94.) Taking Professor Kennedy's rendering, I doubt whether the Apostle would have used this language in respect to the relation existing between God and the Jewish people at the time when he was writing. The Jews gloried in God as their God in a special sense (Rom. ii. 17); but in Paul's view it was *Christians*, now, who rightfully gloried in God through our Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. v. 11; comp. iii. 29).

7. I add a single remark, which might more properly have been made before. I have rendered ὁ χριστός here not "Christ," as a mere proper name, but "the Messiah." Not only the use of the article, but the context, seems to me to require this. Westcott and Hort observe in regard to the word χριστός: "We doubt whether the appellative force, with its various associations and implications, is ever entirely lost in the New Testament, and are convinced that the number of passages is small in which Messiahship, of course in the

nlarged apostolic sense, is not the principal intention of the word." *The N. T. in Greek*, vol. ii., *Introd.*, p. 317.)

IV. We will now take notice of some points connected with the *istory* of the interpretation of Rom. ix. 5. The fullest account of iis is perhaps that given by Schultz in the article already repeatedly eferred to; but he is neither very thorough nor very accurate.

The application of the passage by the Christian Fathers will natur-lly come first under consideration.

The fact that the great majority of the Fathers whose writings have ome down to us understood the last part of the verse to relate to hrist has been regarded by many as a very weighty argument in favor f that construction. I have before had occasion to consider the alue of this argument in connection with another passage. (See bove, p. 8.) The remarks there made apply equally to the present ase. The fact that the Fathers in quoting a passage grammatically mbiguous have given it a construction which suited their theology, oes not help us much in determining the true construction. We nust remember also the looser use of the term θεός which prevailed n the latter part of the second century and later. (See above, p. 20 f.) Those in the second and third centuries who held strongly ne doctrine of the inferiority of the Son, and the Arians in the ourth, like the Socinians at a later period, did not hesitate to apply ne name "God" to Christ, and would find little difficulty in a con-truction of the passage which involved this. They might hesitate bout the expression "God over all;" but, as we have seen, though atural, it is not necessary to connect the ἐπὶ πάντων with θεός.

The specimen of patristic exegesis in the construction given to 2 Cor. iv. 4, where so many of the Fathers make the genitive τοῦ αἰῶνος epend not on ὁ θεός, but τῶν ἀπίστων (see above, p. 8), will be suffi-ient for most persons who wish to form an estimate of their authority n a case like the present. I will only ask further, taking the first xamples that occur to me, how much weight is to be attributed to ne judgment of Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodoret, sidore of Pelusium, Gennadius, Theodorus Monachus, Joannes Damascenus (?), Photius, Œcumenius (or what passes under his ame), and Theophylact, when, in their zeal for the freedom of the ill, they explain πρόθεσις in Rom. viii. 28 (τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς), ot as denoting the Divine purpose, but the purpose or choice of the bjects of the call? (Cyril of Alexandria gives the words both neanings at the same time.) What is the value of the opinion of hrysostom, Joannes Damascenus, Œcumenius, and Theophylact

that *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in Rom. xvi. 27 is to be construed with *στη ρίξαι* in ver. 25? Shall we accept the exegesis of Chrysostom and Theophylact when they tell us that in the injunction of Christ in Matt. v. 39 not to resist *τῷ πονηρῷ*, *τῷ πονηρῷ* means the devil?

Dean Burgon, in his article on "New Testament Revision" in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1882, has given perhaps the fullest enumeration yet presented of Christian writers who have referred the *ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ.* in Rom. ix. 5 to Christ. He counts up "55 illustrious names," 40 of Greek writers from Irenæus in the latter part of the second century to John of Damascus in the eighth, and 15 of Latin writers, from Tertullian at the beginning of the third century to Facundus in the sixth, "who all see in Rom. ix. 5 a glorious assertion of the eternal Godhead of CHRIST." An examination of his list will show that it needs some sifting. Most of the Latin writers whom he mentions, as Augustine, knew little or nothing of Greek, and their authority cannot be very weighty in determining the construction of an ambiguous Greek sentence. Of his illustrious names 6 are unfortunately unknown, being writers, "of whom," as Mr. Burgon mildly puts it, "3 have been mistaken for Athanasius, and 3 for Chrysostom." Another is the illustrious forger of the Answers to Ten Questions of Paul of Samosata, fathered upon Dionysius of Alexandria, "certainly spurious," according to Cardinal Newman and the best scholars generally, and marked as pseudonymous by Mr. Burgon himself. Cæsarius should also have been cited as Pseudo-Cæsarius. Among the other illustrious names we find "6 of the Bishops at the Council of Antioch, A. D. 269." On looking at the names as they appear in Routh's *Rell. Sacrae*, ed. alt. (1846), iii. 289, I regret my inability to recall the deeds or the occasion that made them "illustrious," unless it is the fact that, as members of that Council, about half a century before the Council of Nicæa, they *condemned* the use of the term *ὁμοούσιος*, "consubstantial," which was established by the latter as the test and watchword of orthodoxy.

Next to the six Bishops and "ps.-Dionysius Alex." in Mr. Burgon's list of the illustrious Fathers "who see in Rom. ix. 5 a glorious assertion of the eternal Godhead of Christ," we find "Constt. App.," that is, the Apostolical Constitutions, with a reference to "vi. c. 26." He does not quote the passage. It reads as follows:—"Some of the heretics imagine the Christ [so Lagarde; or "the Lord," Cotelier and Ueltzen] to be a mere man . . . ; but others of them suppose that Jesus himself is the God over all, glorifying him as his own Father, supposing him to be Son and Paraclete; than which doctrines what can be more abominable?" Compare Const.

Apost. iii. 17:—"The Father is the God over all, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός; Christ is the only-begotten God, the beloved Son, the Lord of glory." See also vi. 18.

One is surprised, after this, to find that Mr. Burgon did not cite for the same purpose Pseudo-Ignatius *ad Tars.* cc. 2, 5, and *ad Philip.* c. 7, where it is denied emphatically that Christ is ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός; and also Origen, *Cont. Cels.* viii. 14, who says:—"Grant that there are some among the multitude of believers, with their differences of opinion, who rashly suppose that the Saviour is the Most High God over all; yet certainly we do not, for we believe him when he said, *The Father who sent me is greater than I.*" The very strong language which Origen uses in many other places respecting the inferiority of the Son, renders it unlikely that he applied the last part of this verse to Christ. See, e. g. *Cont. Cels.* viii. 15; *De Princip.* i. 3. § 5; *In Joan.* tom. ii. cc. 2, 3, 6; vi. 23; xiii. 25. Rufinus's Latin version of Origen's Comm. on Romans, which is the only authority for ascribing to Origen the common interpretation of this passage, is no authority at all. He, according to his own account of his work, had so transformed it by omissions, additions, and alterations, that his friends thought he ought to claim it as his own.* It was in accordance with his professed principles to omit or alter in the works which he translated whatever he regarded as dangerous, particularly whatever did not conform to his standard of orthodoxy. His falsification of other writings of Origen is notorious. Westcott and Hort remark that in the Rufino-Origenian commentary on this verse "there is not a trace of Origenian language, and this is one of the places in which Rufinus would not fail to indulge his habit of altering an interpretation which he disapproved on doctrinal grounds." They also remark, "it is difficult to impute Origen's silence to accident in the many places in which quotation would have been natural had he followed the common interpretation."

Origen should therefore be henceforth excluded from the list of Fathers cited in support of the common punctuation. It is even "probable," as Westcott and Hort maintain, though "not certain," that he and Eusebius gave the passage a different construction.

*See his *Peroratio* at the end of the Epistle; Origenis *Opp.* iv. 688 f., ed. Delarue. Matthaei remarks: "Rufini interpretatio, quæ parum fidei habet, in epistola ad Romanos, quod quilibet ipse intelligit, non tam pro Origenis opere, quam pro compendio Rufini haberi debet, quod haud dubie alia omisit, alia, sicut in ceteris libris, invito Origene admisit."—*Pauli Epp. ad Thess.*, etc. (Rigae, 1785), Praefatio, sig. b2. See more fully to the same purpose Redepenning's *Origenes*, ii. 189 ff., who speaks of his "Ausscheidung ganzer Stücke," and "Umgestaltung des Heterodoxen in der Trinitätslehre."

As regards Eusebius, the presumption is perhaps even stronger than in the case of Origen. He has nowhere quoted the passage; but in very numerous places in his writings he uses *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* as a title exclusively belonging to the Father, and insists upon this against the Sabellians.* I admit that these considerations are not decisive; he and Origen may have given the passage an interpretation similar to that of Hippolytus; but if they understood it to relate to Christ it is certainly strange that they have nowhere quoted it in their numerous writings.

The assumption that Irenæus referred the last part of this verse to Christ must be regarded as doubtful. The only place where he has quoted it is *Haer.* iii. 16. (al. 18.) § 3, where his text is preserved only in the old Latin version, which of course cannot determine the construction which Irenæus put upon the Greek. He does not quote it to prove that Christ is *θεός*; the Gnostics gave the name *θεός* to their Æons, and also to the Demiurgus; but to prove the unity of the *Christ* with the man Jesus, in opposition to the Gnostics who maintained that the Æon Christ did not descend upon Jesus till his baptism. He had just before (§ 2) quoted Matt. i. 18 for this purpose (reading *τοῦ δὲ χριστοῦ*); he now quotes Rom. i. 3, 4; ix. 5; and Gal. iv. 4, 5, for the same purpose. His argument rests on the *ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, and not on the last part of the verse, on which he makes no remark. Throughout his work against Heresies, and very often, Irenæus uses the title "the God over all" as the exclusive designation of the Father."†

The passage in which Hippolytus quotes Rom. ix. 5 (*Cont. Noët.* c. 6) has already been noticed. (See above, pp. 126, 130.). The Noetians and Patripassians, according to him, quoted the text to prove the identity of Christ with the Father. (*Ibid.* cc. 2, 3.) He complains that they treat the words *μονοκώλως* (or *μονόκωλα*); comp. Epiph. *Haer.* lvii. 2. Westcott and Hort understand this to mean

* See, for example, *De Eccl. Theol.* i. 3, 7, 8, 11, 20; ii. 1, 4, 5 (pp. 62 c, 65 a, 66 c, 70 d, 93 c, 104 a, 107 c d), and a multitude of other places, some of which are quoted in Wetstein's note. The apparent exception, *Hist. Eccl.* viii. 11, *τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν χριστὸν ἐπιβοωμένους* (ed. Vales.), is a false reading: Burton, Schwegler, Læmmer and Dindorf omit *χριστόν* on the authority of important MSS.; on the other hand Heinichen in his recent edition (1868) omits *ἐπὶ πάντων θεόν*, and reads *τὸν χριστόν* simply.

† Semler, *Ep. ad Griesbachium*, 1770, p. 77 ff.; *Antwort* etc. 1770, p. 45), and Whitby (*Disq. modesta*, p. 125 f.) take the above view of this passage of Irenæus. For the use of the designation "God over all," see Iren. *Haer.* ii. 5. § 4; 6. (al. 5.) §§ 2. 3; 11. (al. 12.) § 1 *bis*; 13. (al. 18.) § 8; 24. (al. 41.) § 2; 28. (al. 49.) § 8; iii. 8. § 3; iv. 5. (al. 10.) § 1; v. 18. § 1, and many other passages.

at they read all the words from καὶ ἐξ ὧν to αἰῶνας "as a single
ause." Semler once took nearly the same view (*Hist. Eccl.* zu S. J.
umgarten's *Unters. theol. Streitigkeiten*, 1762, i. 217, n. 205), but
s afterwards doubtful about it (*ibid.* p. 236, n. 235). Fabricius in
s note on the passage, and Salmond in his translation of Hippoly-
s in the *Ante-Nicene Christ. Library* ix. 53, give a very different
planation. To discuss the matter here would require too much
ace, but it seemed well to mention it. Possibly in *Cont. Noët.* c. 6
λογητός is misplaced through the mistake of a scribe, and should
nd before εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Dean Burgon refers also to "Phil. 339," that is to the *Philosophu-
na* or *Ref. omn. Haer.* x. 34, *ad fin.* But ὁ κατὰ πάντων θεός
ere should not, I think, be alleged as a quotation of Rom. ix. 5
plied to Christ. Bunsen's easy emendation of the passage (*Anal.
te-Nic.* i. 392; comp. his *Hippolytus*, 2d ed., i. 413) seems to me
e true reading, and is supported by x. 33 *ad init.* (p. 334), where
τοῦ μόνος καὶ κατὰ πάντων θεός is distinguished from the Logos.
ippolytus could hardly have called Christ "*the* God over all."

I note in passing that Tischendorf cites incorrectly for the reference
the ὁ ὢν &c. to Christ "Meth. conviv 8os (Gall 3)." The passage
ferred to is not from the *Convivium*, but from the discourse of the
eudo-Methodius *De Simeone et Anna*, c. 1 *ad fin.*, where we have
e mere expression τῆς ἀστέκτου δόξης τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ συγκατά-
σιν. This is also one of Dean Burgon's authorities; but, as the
iter explains himself (c. 2 *ad fin.*), he seems to mean by "the glory
the God over all" not the glory of the Son considered by himself,
t the glory of the whole Trinity. There is no quotation of Rom.
5 here.

The passage of Amphilochius (Gallandi vi. 409, or Migne xxxix.
1) which Tischendorf adduces, with a *videtur*, as a reference of
om. ix. 5 to the Father, seems analogous to the above, and hardly
oves anything on one side or the other.

In the quotation of Rom. ix. 5 in the Antiochene Epistle to Paul
Samosata (see above, p. 134) it is probable that the six Bishops
ade a slight pause at πάντων. The subordination of the Son is very
ongly expressed in the Epistle. Among other things it is said,
To think that the God of the universe is called a messenger (ἄγγελον)
impious; but the Son is the messenger of the Father, being himself
rd and God." (Routh, *ut supra*, p. 294.)

The Emperor Julian has already been referred to. (See above, p.
, note.) He was as good a judge of the construction of a Greek
ntence as Cyril of Alexandria, or any other of the Fathers, and

quite as likely to interpret impartially. Well acquainted with th writings of the Christians, he could hardly have overlooked passage so frequently quoted in the controversies on the nature of Christ a Rom. ix. 5 and Tit. ii. 13. But he did not find the title *θεός* give to Christ in these or any other places (e. g., 1 Tim. iii. 16) in th writings of Paul.

Among the orthodox Greek Fathers, Diodorus (of Antioch an Tarsus) and Photius appear to have understood the *ὁ ὤν*, &c., to refe to God. The comment of Diodorus on this passage is preserved i the important Catena on the Epistle to the Romans published b Cramer from a MS. in the Bodleian Library (Cramer's *Catenæ in N. T* vol. iv. Oxon. 1844). The essential part of it reads:—*καὶ τὸ μέγιστον ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. ἐξ αὐτῶν, φησὶν, ὁ χριστός. θεὸς δ οὐ μόνων αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ κοινῇ ἐπὶ πάντων ἐστὶ θεός.* (p. 162.) Thi appears to mean, "From them, he says, is the Messiah. But God belongs not to them alone, but is God over all men alike." Meyer Tholuck, Philippi, and Schultz understand it as relating to th Father. I do not perceive that this reference is affected by the fac that Theodore of Mopsuestia, a pupil of Diodorus, who has borrowe much of the language of this comment, gives the last part a differen turn:—*καὶ τὸ δὴ μέγιστον, ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὃς ἐστ θεὸς οὐ μόνων αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ κοινῇ πάντων.* (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* lxvi 833.) Had it been the purpose of Diodorus to express this meaning he would probably have inserted *ἐστιν* after *θεὸς δέ*, or have written *ὅς ἐστιν*. The omission of the article before *θεός* creates no diffi culty in taking *θεός* as the subject of the sentence. It is ofte omitted in such a case by these later Greek writers.*

Diodorus, it will be remembered, was the founder of a compar atively rational, grammatico-historical and logical school of interpre tation, in opposition to the arbitrary exegesis of Scripture which ha prevailed among the Fathers.

The passage in Photius (*Cont. Manich.* iii. 14) appears to b unequivocal:—"He cries with a loud voice,—*whose are the covenants and the laws* (*αἱ νομοθεσίαι*), *and the promises, and the holy services* (*α λατρεῖαι*); and showing most clearly whence these things are, and o whose providence they have depended [he adds], *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸ εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.*" "So the laws and the holy service and the promises, in the observance of which the fathers pleased God

*See, for example, Theodore of Mopsuestia on Rom. ii. 15; viii. 28 ix. 10, 14 *bis*, 22–24, 25; xi. 2. (Migne, lxvi. coll. 789[b], 832[a], 833[d], 836 840[b], 841[c], 841[d], 852[a].) See also Cramer, p. 11, l. 30; 15, l. 15; 27, l. 24 54, l. 22, etc.

nd from whom as to his humanity sprang the Messiah, are from the od over all, τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεοῦ." (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* cii. 157.) Schultz, in the essay so often referred to (p. 480, note 2), says that heodulus *in loc.* seems to refer the last part of our verse to God. He misapprehends the meaning of the passage in Theodulus, and oes not observe that it is taken from Œcumenius.* The *Enarratio Ep. ad Romanos* which, in a Latin translation, passes under the ame of Theodulus, does not belong to the presbyter or bishop in œle-Syria of that name, who died A. D. 492, but is a very late atena. (See Cave.)

A few words now respecting the Latin Fathers who have quoted om. ix. 5.

Tertullian is the first. He quotes it once as below, and once *Prax.* c. 15) with *super omnia* before *deus.*† Cyprian simply cites e passage to prove that Christ is *deus* (*qui est super omnia deus benectus in sæcula*), without remark. (*Testim.* ii. 6.) Novatian has ready been spoken of. (See above, p. 126.)

I know of no trace of the reference of the last part of the verse to od among the Latin writers, except what may be implied in the nguage of the Pseudo-Ambrosius (Ambrosiaster), commonly iden-ied with Hilary the deacon, in his commentary on the Epistle. He marks:—"Si quis autem non putat de Christo dictum, *qui est Deus*, t personam de qua dictum est. De patre enim Deo hoc loco entio facta non est." This is repeated in the commentary of Raba-us Maurus (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* cxi. col. 1482). The same in bstance appears in the *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.*, qu. 91, formerly cribed to Augustine, and printed in the Benedictine edition of his

---

*See *Biblioth. max. vet. Patrum*, viii. 605, or the *Monumenta S. atrum Orthodoxographa* of Grynæus, ii. 1163.

†After remarking that he never speaks of Gods or Lords, but following the Apostle, when the Father and Son are to be named together, lls the Father God, and Jesus Christ Lord, he says:—"Solum autem hristum potero deum dicere, sicut idem apostolus. *Ex quibus hristus, qui est*, inquit, *deus super omnia benedictus in aevum omne.* am et radium solis seorsum solem vocabo; solem antem nominans, ius est radius, non statim et radium solem appellabo." (*Prax.* c. 13, . Oehler.) This accords with his language elsewhere:—"Protulit us sermonem . . . sicut radix fruticem, et fons fluvium, et sol dium." (*Prax.* c. 8.) "Cum radius ex sole porrigitur, portio ex mma; sed sol erit in radio . . . nec separatur substantia, sed tenditur." (*Apologet.* c. 21.) "Pater tota substantia est; filius vero rivatio totius et portio; sicut ipse profitetur, *Quia pater maior me est.*" *Prax.* c. 9.) "Sermo deus, quia ex deo . . . Quodsi deus dei tanam substantiva res, non erit ipse deus [αὐτόθεος], sed hactenus deus, ia ex ipsius substantia, ut portio aliqua totius." (*Prax.* c. 26.)

works, *Opp.* III. ii. 2915, ed. Bened. alt.: "Sed forte ad Patris pe sonam pertinere dicatur. Sed hoc loco nulla est paterni nomin mentio. Ideoque si de Christo dictum negatur, persona cui com petat detur."—This work is generally ascribed to the Hilary mentione above.—The writer seems to have heard of those who interpreted th passage of God; and relying apparently upon the Latin version, h meets their interpretation of the Greek with a very unintelligen objection.

The Greek Fathers in Mr. Burgon's list who have not already bee mentioned are the following:—Athanasius, Basil, Didymus, Gregor of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Theodorus Mops., Eustathius, Eulogius Theophilus Alex., Nestorius, Theodotus of Ancyra, Chrysostom Theodoret, Amphilochius, Gelasius Cyz , Anastasius Ant., Leontiu Byz., Maximus. Of the Latins, Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome Victorinus, the Breviarium, Marius Mercator, Cassian, Alcimus Avit. Fulgentius, Ferrandus.

"Against such a torrent of Patristic testimony," says Mr. Burgon "it will not surely be pretended that the Socinian interpretation, t which our Revisionists give such prominence, can stand."

But to what does it all amount? Simply to the fact that a mass o writers, to the judgment of most of whom an intelligent schola would attach very little weight in any question of exegesis, have fol lowed that construction of an ambiguous passage which suited thei theological opinions. Out of the whole list, the two, I suppose, wh would be most generally selected as distinguished from the rest fo sobriety and good sense in interpretation, are Chrysostom and Theo doret. Yet both of them adopted that excessively unnatural if no impossible construction of 2 Cor. iv. 4 of which I have spoken above (See p. 8, also p. 133 f.)

The same general considerations apply to the ancient versions some of which are ambiguous here, as Westcott and Hort remark though the translators probably intended to have the last part of th verse understood of Christ.

(I now observe, too late for correction in the printed sheet, that, i citing the opinion of the eminent scholars just named respecting th construction given to Rom. ix. 5 by Origen and Eusebius, I have represented them as regarding it as "probable though not certain" that these Fathers understood the last clause as relating to God. Their note does imply that they are inclined to this view; but I now suppose that the words quoted were intended to apply to the Apos tolic Constitutions and the Pseudo-Ignatius. Westcott and Hort also refer, for the application of the phrase ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός to the Father

distinction from Christ, to 'Melito p. 413 Otto,' i. e. to his *Apol.* gm. 2; comp. Routh, i. 118 ed. alt.

We will now dismiss the Fathers, and notice some facts belonging the more recent history of the interpretation of our passage.* I tice the different constructions in the order in which they are num-red above, pp. 89, 90.

The three most important recent discussions of the passage outside the commentaries, before that of Dr. Dwight, are by Dr. Hermann ultz, in the *Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theol.*, 1868, pp. 462–506, who ends constructions Nos. 1–3, with a slight preference for No. 1 483); Dr. C. L. Wilibald Grimm, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. s. Theol.*, 1869, pp. 311–322, who adopts No. 5; and Pastor Ernst rmsen, *ibid.* 1872, pp. 510–521, who adopts No. 7. There is a ef discussion of the passage by Dr. G. Vance Smith, Canon Farrar, l Dr. Sanday, in *The Expositor* for May, 1879, ix. 397–405, and ot., 1879, x. 232–238. There was a more extended debate in *The dependent* (New York) for Aug. 12, Oct. 14, 21, 28, and Nov. 18, 58, in which Dr. John Proudfit (anonymously), the Rev. Joseph Thompson (the editor), Dr. Z. S. Barstow, and E. A. took part. 1–3. It would be idle to give a list of the supporters of Nos. 1–3, o refer the clause in question to Christ. Among the commentators, haps the more eminent and best known are Calvin, Beza, Ham-nd, Le Clerc, Limborch, Bengel, Michaelis, Koppe, Flatt, oluck, Olshausen, Stuart, Hodge, Philippi, Lange (with Schaff l Riddle), Hofmann, Weiss, Godet, Alford, Vaughan, Sanday ry doubtfully), Gifford. That the Roman Catholic commentators, Estius, Klee, Stengel, Reithmayr, Maier, Beelen, Bisping (not very sitively), Jatho, Klofutar (1880), should adopt this explanation, is ost a matter of course. This construction of the verse is accepted all the *Fratres Poloni*, who did not hesitate to give the name God Christ, and to worship him, recognizing of course the supremacy the Father, to whom they applied the name God in a higher sense;

Literature.—The older literature is given by Wolf (*Curae*) and ienthal (*Biblischer Archivarius*, 1745). For the more recent, see nz, and especially Schultz in the article so often referred to; also ong the commentators, Meyer and Van Hengel. E. F. C. Oertel *hristologie*, Hamb. 1792, p. 216 ff.) gives a brief account of the con-versy excited by Semler (1769-71); see also the works named by ultz, especially Hirt's *Orient. u. exeg. Bibliothek*, 1772, 1773. The me Bremer (Schultz, p. 462, note 2) is a misprint for Benner.

so Socinus,* *Opp.* ii. 581, 582, 600 a; cf. ii. 377 f.; John Crell, *in lo* *Opp.* i. 147; also *Respons. ad Grotium*, *Opp.* iv. 230 b; *De Uno D* *Patre*, p. 23 a; *De Deo ejusque Attrib.*, p. 35 b; *Eth. Christ.*, p. 348 Schlichting (*Lat.* Slichtingius), *Comm. post.* i. 254; Wolzogen, *Op* i. 710, 712; ii. 301; iii. 5; Sam. Przipcovius or Przpkowsky *in loc* p. 51. So also the Racovian Catechism, §§ 159, 160.

With a singular disregard of these historical facts, Dean Burgo holds up his hands in holy horror at the marginal renderings of th Revised New Testament at Rom. ix. 5, ascribed to "some moder Interpreters," and stigmatizes them as "*the Socinian gloss*"! (*Qua* *Rev.*, Jan., 1882, p. 54.) The Italics are his. He seems throug out his article to imagine himself to be writing for readers who wi take an opprobrious epithet for an argument. The real "Socinia gloss" is adopted, and the arguments for it are repeated, as we ha seen, by the latest prominent defender of the construction which M Burgon himself maintains; among English commentators compa Macknight on the passage.

A slight qualification, or supplement, of the above statement i however, required. Schlichting, though he does not object to th common construction, misled by Erasmus, is inclined to suspect th genuineness of the word θεός. It is important in reference to th history of the interpretation of this passage, to observe that the stat ment of Erasmus in regard to the omission of this word in the qu tations by some of the Fathers, led many astray, among othe Grotius, who also incorrectly represents the word God as wanting the Syriac version. Schoettgen misrepresented the case still wors saying, by mistake of course, "Hoc verbum quamplurimi Codice quidam etiam ex Patribus, non habent."

Schlichting also suggests, as what "venire alicui in mente posset," the somewhat famous conjecture of ὢν ὁ for ὁ ὤν, but *reje* it. It was taken up afterwards, however, by a man far inferior judgment, Samuel Crell (not to be confounded with the emine commentator), in the "*Initium Ev. S. Joannis restitutum*" (1726), pu lished under the pseudonym of L. M. Artemonius. Its superfici

*Socinus speaks of the punctuation and construction proposed Erasmus, a believer in the deity of Christ, which makes the ὁ ὤν, et a doxology to God, the Father, and says:—"Non est ulla causa, cur ha interpretatio, vel potius lectio et interpunctio Erasmi rejici posse vid atur; nisi una tantum, quam Adversarii non afferunt; neque enim illa animadverterunt. Ea est, quod, cum simplex nomen Benedictus ide significat quod Benedictus sit, semper fere solet anteponi ei, ad que refertur, perraro autem postponi."

Some of those who are so shocked at what they call "Socinian glosses might perhaps learn a lesson of candor and fairness from this hereti

plausibility seems to have fascinated many, among them Whitby (*Last Thoughts*), Jackson of Leicester (*Annot. ad Novat.* p. 341), John Taylor of Norwich, Goadby, Wakefield (*Enquiry*), Bishop Edmund Law (Wakefield's *Memoirs*, i. 447), Belsham (*Epistles of Paul*), John Jones, and David Schulz (so says Baumgarten-Crusius). Even Doddridge and Harwood speak of it as "ingenious," and Olshausen calls it "scharfsinnig." It does not deserve the slightest consideration.

Among the writers on Biblical Theology, Usteri (*Paulin. Lehrbegr.*, 5te Ausg., 1834, p. 324 f.) refers the clause in question to Christ, but strongly expresses his sense of the great difficulties which this involves. He is influenced especially by Rückert (1831), who afterwards changed his mind. Messner (1856, p. 236 f.) regards this reference as probable, though not certain; somewhat more doubtful is C. F. Schmid (2d ed., 1859, p. 540 f., or p. 475 f., Eng. trans.). Dorner in his recent work, *System der chirstl. Glaubenslehre* (1879), p. 345, only ventures to say that the reference to Christ is "the most natural." Schott, August Hahn, De Wette, Reuss, Ritschl, are sometimes cited as supporting this construction; but later they all went over to the other side. See below, under No. 7.

For the most elaborate defences of the construction we are considering, besides those which have already been mentioned, one may consult Dr. John Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, 5th ed. (1859), vol. ii. pp. 370–377, 401–405; and the commentaries of Flatt (from whom Prof. Stuart has borrowed largely) and Philippi.

4. Construction No. 4 has already been sufficiently noticed. (See above, p. 130.)

5. The construction which puts a colon or a period after πάντων, making the clause beginning with θεός a doxology to God, seems to have been first suggested by Erasmus in the Annotations to his 3d edition of the Greek Testament (1522), repeated in the 4th (1527). In his later writings, and in the note in his last edition (1535), while recognizing the possibility of this construction, he gave the preference to No. 7.* It was adopted by Locke in his posthumous *Paraphrase*, etc. (Lond. 1705, and often):—"and of them, as to his fleshly extraction, Christ is come, he who is over all, God be blessed for ever, Amen." Locke's construction was preferred by Wetstein in the important note on the passage in his Greek Testament, vol. ii. (1752), and was adopted by Prof. L. J. C. Justi in Paulus's *Memorabilien*, 1791, St. i. pp. 1 26; treated more fully in his *Vermischte Abhandlungen*, 2te Samml., 1798, pp. 309 346; also by E. F. C.

*Erasmi *Opp.*, Lugd. Bat. 1703 ff., vol. vi. 610 f.; ix. 1002 f., 1045 f.

Oertel, *Christologie* (1792), p. 209 f. He has a pretty full discussion of the passage (pp. 195–218). So by G. L. Bauer, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.*, Bd. iv. (1802), pp. 10–14; and by C. F. Ammon, for though in his *Bibl. Theol.*, 2te Ausg. (1801), pp. 220–222, he does not decide between constructions No. 5 and No. 7, he favors the former in his note on the passage in the third edition of Koppe on Romans (1824). J. J. Stolz adopts it in the 4th ed. of his *Uebersetzung des N. T.* (1804) and the 3d ed. of his *Erläuterungen* (1808), iii. 170–191. He gives there an interesting extract from Semler's *Hist. u. krit. Sammlungen über die sogenannten Beweisstellen in der Dogmatik*, St. ii. pp. 284–287. So De Wette in the text of the 3d ed. of his German translation of the Bible (1839), though he gives constructions Nos. 1 and 7 as alternative renderings; in the note in the 4th and last edition of his commentary on the Epistle (1847), though undecided, he seems on the whole rather inclined to No. 7. This construction (No. 5) is supported also by Baumgarten-Crusius, a scholar to be spoken of with high respect, in his *Comm.* on the Epistle (Jena, 1844), comp. his *Grundzüge der bibl. Theol.* (1828), p. 385 f., and his *Exeget. Schriften zum N. T.*, II. i. (Jena, 1844) p. 266, the latter cited by Ernesti. So by Schumann in his *Christus* (1852), ii. 545, note; H. Fr. Th. L. Ernesti, *Vom Ursprunge d. Sunde nach paulin. Lehrgehalte*, i. (1855) pp. 197–204; Märcker (cited by Meyer), whose work I have not seen, and Reuss, *Les Epitres pauliniennes* (1878), ii. 88.

The best defence of this view, perhaps. is to be found in the article of Grimm, referred to above.

6. On construction No. 6 see above, p. 132.

7. Erasmus in his *translation* renders the words of the last part of our verse thus :—"et ii, ex quibus est Christus quantum attinet ad carnem, qui est in omnibus deus laudandus in secula, amen," which he perhaps intended for an ambiguous rendering, as *est* might be supplied after *laudandus*. His *paraphrase* also seems ambiguous.* But this as it may, in the note in his last edition (1535), and in his later writings, he clearly indicates his preference for construction No. 7.†

*"At Christus sic est homo, ut idem et Deus sit, non huius aut illius gentis peculiaris, sed universorum Deus, et idem cum patre Deus, qui [Christus? pater? *or* Pater cum Christo?] praesidet omnibus, cuiusque inscrutabili consilio geruntur haec omnia, cui soli . . . debetur laus" &c. One suggestion of Erasmus is that the word "God" in the last clause may denote the whole Trinity.

†See especially his *Apol. adv. monachos quosdam Hispanos* (written in 1528), *Opp.* ix. 1043-47:—"Ego coram Deo profiteor mihi videri *Paulum* hoc sensisse, quod modo significavimus, nec hunc sermonem proprie ad *Christum* pertinere, sed vel ad Patrem, vel ad totam Trinitatem" (col. 1045): comp. *Resp. ad Juvenem Gerontodidascalum* (writ-

BUCER (or Butzer) *in loc.* (1536?) as quoted by Wetstein, suggests his construction as an alternative rendering. CURCELLÆUS (Courcelles) in his edition of the Greek Testament published in 1658 (also 1675, 85, 99) notes that "Quidam addunt punctum post vocem ἄρχα. quia si id quod sequitur cum præcedentibus connecteretur, otius dicendum videatur ὅς ἐστι, vel ὃς ὤν, quam ὁ ὤν.

Others who have adopted or favored this construction are WHISTON, n his *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, vol. iv. (1711), p. 13 ff.; Dr. amuel CLARKE, in his *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, Lond. 1712, d ed., 1732, p. 85 ff. He gives also as admissible constructions No. 5 and No. 2, but places No. 7 first. He was, as is well known, ne of the best classical scholars of his day, as well as one of the blest metaphysicians and theologians. So John JACKSON of Leicester, in his *Annot. ad Novatianum* (1727), p. 341, though captivated by he specious but worthless conjecture of ὢν ὁ; WETSTEIN, as an alternative rendering, but rather preferring to place the stop after πάντων see the end of his note); SEMLER, *Paraph. Ep. ad Rom.* (1769), p. 14 ff., and in many other writings; on the literature of the Semler ontroversy see the references given above, p. 141. Semler was not so ell acquainted with the writings of the later, as with those of the arlier Fathers, and in this part of the field of debate his adversaries ad the advantage. But he gave a stimulus to a freer and more impartial treatment of the question. ECKERMANN adopted the construction we are now considering in the *second* edition (1795) of his *Theologische Beyträge*, Bd. I. St. iii. pp. 160–162, though in the first edition he had opposed it.

Coming now to the present century, we find this construction dopted by the commentators C. F. BOEHME (Lips. 1806), and H. . G. PAULUS, *Des Apostels Paulus Lehr-Briefe an die Galater- und Römer-Christen* (Heidelb. 1831), where he translates (p. 102): "Der ber alle (Juden und Heiden) seyende Gott sey gepriesen auf (alle) ie Zeitalter hinaus"; by Prof. J. F. WINZER of Leipzig in a *Programma* on Rom. ix. 1–5 (Lips. 1832), which I have not seen, but nd highly praised; and Karl SCHRADER, *Der Apostel Paulus*, Theil i. (1833), p. 75, and Theil iv. (1835), p. 355. He translates, 'Der über Allem Seiende (der welcher über Allem ist,) Gott, gelobt sei gelobt) in Ewigkeit!" It is adopted in three commentaries of emarkable independence and ability which appeared in 1834, namely

---

en 1532), col. 1002:—"ipsa res loquitur, verba Pauli nullum sensum videntius reddere quam hunc: *Deus, qui est super omnia, sit benedictus in secula.* Cui precationi accinitur, *Amen.*" See also above, under No. 5.

those of Prof. J. G. REICHE of Göttingen, whose note (Theil ii. pp. 268–278) is one of the fullest and best discussions of the passage, though he makes some mistakes about the Fathers; Prof. Eduard KOELLNER of Göttingen, and Dr. Conrad GLÖCKLER, whom Prof. Stuart calls "a Nicenian" as regards his theological position. In the 4th edition of K. G. BRETSCHNEIDER'S *Handbuch der Dogmatik* (1838) i. 604 f., he adopts our construction, though in the earlier editions of this work he had referred the θεός to Christ. He translates: "Der Herrüber alles, Gott, sei gepriesen in Ewigkeit." In 1839, Prof L. J. RÜCKERT of Jena, in the 2d edition of his elaborate and valuable commentary (vol. ii. pp. 13–17) discusses the passage fully, and though in the first edition (1831) he had strenuously contended for the reference of the last part of the verse to Christ, now pronounces the construction which makes it a doxology to God "far more probable." This year is also signalized in the history of the interpretation of our passage by the publication of vol. ii. of the commentary of Prof. C. F. A. FRITZSCHE of Rostock, who discusses the passage in a masterly manner (pp. 260–275). His translation has been given above, p. 106. In the 4th edition of his Greek Testament with a Latin version, published in 1839, Prof. H. A. SCHOTT of Jena adopted the punctuation and construction which make the clause beginning with ὁ ὢν a doxology to God, though in previous editions he had followed the common construction. In his essay *De Invocatione Jesu Christi Partic.* I. (1843), p. 8, thehighly esteemed commentator Dr. Friedrich LÜCKE, Professor at Göttingen, refers the last part of our verse to God. Professor A. L. G. KREHL of Leipzig does the same in his *Der Brief an die Römer ausgelegt* u. s. w. (1845), p. 322, though in an earlier work, *Neutest. Handwörterbuch* (1843) art. *Christus*, p. 114, he had cited Rom. ix. 5 in proof that Christ is called God.

BAUR, who makes the passage a doxology to God, has some valuable remarks upon it in his *Paulus* (1845), p. 624 f., 2te Aufl. (1866–67), ii. 263 f.; comp. his *Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit* (1841), i. 84, note. ZELLER agrees with him (*Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1842, p. 55). So J. F. RÄBIGER, a believer in the divine nature of Christ, in his *De Christologia Paulina contra Baurium Commentatio* (1852), pp. 26–28.

We may notice here the great commentators DE WETTE and MEYER. De Wette, not perfectly satisfied with any view, yet wavers between constructions Nos. 5 and 7; see above under No. 5. In his *Bibl. Dogmatik*, 3te Aufl. (1831), p. 249, and in the 2d ed. of his translation of the N. T., he had taken the name "God" here as a

lesignation of Christ; but in the 3d ed. of his translation he makes it begin a doxology. MEYER in his *Das N. T. griechisch mit einer neuen Deutschen Uebersetzung* (1829) followed the common construction; but in the first edition of his *Comm.* (1836), and all later eds., he makes the passage a doxology to God. His collaborator, HUTHER, maintains in his note on Tit. ii. 13 that the name θεός is not given to Christ in any of the New Testament Epistles.

In 1855 appeared the first edition of JOWETT's work on four of the Epistles of Paul (2d ed., 1859). He translates: "God, who is over all, is blessed for ever. Amen." So Bp. COLENSO, *St. Paul's Ep. to the Romans*, &c., Lond., 1861; Amer. ed., New York, 1863.

Prof. J. H. SCHOLTEN of Leyden, in his *Dogmatices Christ. Initia*, ed. 2da, Lugd. Bat. 1858, p. 193 f., adopts our construction. So Athanase COQUEREL, *Christologie* (Paris, 1858), i. 76, note. So the celebrated Dutch commentator, VAN HENGEL, who in tom. ii. of his *Interpretatio* (1859), pp. 343 360, discusses the passage very fully. He mentions some Dutch scholars that agree with him, as VISSERING and SCHEFFER (*Godgel. Bijdragen* 1853 and 1854), whose writings I have not seen. The eminent Danish commentator, Dr. H. N. CLAUSEN, *Pauli Brev til Romerne fortolket* (Copenhagen, 1863), p. 324, translates: "Han som er over Alt, Gud, (eller, "Gud, som er over Alt") være priset i Evighed!" (He is the author of the *Hermeneutik*—the Germans spell his name Klausen.) HOLTZMANN in his translation of the Epistle in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk* (1864), vol. iv., gives the same construction to the passage; and so Prof. Willibald BEYSCHLAG of Halle, in his *Christologie des N. T.*, Berl. 1866, p. 209 f.

Prof. R. A. LIPSIUS of Jena, in the *Protestanten-Bibel Neuen Testamentes* (1872–73), p. 572, translates:—"Der da ist über Alles, Gott, sei gelobt in Ewigkeit"; VOLKMAR, *Römerbrief* (Zürich, 1875), p. 32:—"Der über Allen seiende Gott sei gelobt in Ewigkeit!" His comment is (p. 97):—"Der Gott, der über *allen* (Völkern) waltet, sei dafür gepriesen, dass er aus Israel den Heiland (für Alle) hervorgehen liess." The Rev. John H. GODWIN, "Hon. Prof. New Coll., Lond.," and Congregational Lecturer, translates, "God who is over all be praised for ever. Amen.," and has a good note. (*Ep. to Rom.*, Lond. 1873.) Prof. Lewis CAMPBELL, the editor of Sophocles, in the *Contemp. Rev.* for Aug., 1876, p. 484, adopts the rendering of Prof. Jowett. The Rev. Joseph Agar BEET, Wesleyan Methodist, in a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans of very marked ability (Lond. 1877, 2d ed., 1881), defends this view in an excellent note (pp. 267–272, 2d ed.). The same construction is followed in Herm. BARTELS's *Exeget. Uebersetzung des Briefs*, etc. (Dessau, 1878), which

I mention because Prof. WOLDEMAR SCHMIDT of Leipzig in a notice of the book (*Theol Literaturzeitung*, 1879, No. 22), expresses his approval of this. C. HOLSTEN, in an article in the *Jahrbücher f. prot. Theol.*, 1879, p. 683, translates:—"Der über allen Völkern waltende Gott (der doch Israels Volk so begnadet hat) sei gepriesen in Ewigkeit!"

Some of the best recent *translations* adopt this construction of the passage; e. g. *Het Nieuwe Testament*, etc. (published by the authority of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church), Amst., 1868:—"Hij, die over alles is, God, zij geprezen tot in eeuwigheid!" and the versions by Dr. George R. NOYES (Boston, 1869), Hugues OLTRAMARE (Genéve, 1872), "Que celui qui gouverne toutes choses, Dieu, en soit béni éternellement!" Carl WEIZSÄCKER, *Das N. T. uebersetzt*, Tübingen, 1875, and Dr. Samuel DAVIDSON, Lond., 1875, 2d ed. 1876.

No one who knew the scholarship and the impartiality of the late Dr. Noyes will wonder that I have cited him here. A dispassionate, judicial spirit in the examination of such questions as the one before us is not the exclusive posession of the Dean of Chichester and of "the Church" in distinction from "the Sects," though there are many noble examples of it in the Church of England.

Among critical *editors* of the Greek Testament who have placed a period after *σάρκα*, making the passage a doxology to God, I may mention HARWOOD (1776), LACHMANN, (1831–50), SCHOTT (4th ed., 1839), TISCHENDORF (1841–73), VON MURALT (1846–48), BUTTMANN (1856–67), Aug. HAHN, assisted by his son G. L. Hahn (1861), KUENEN and COBET (1861), and Westcott and Hort (1881) in their margin, representing the judgment of Dr. HORT.

To these authorities may be added the names of the grammarians WINER and WILKE. See Winer, *Gram.* 7te Aufl., 1867, §§ 61, 3, e., and 64, 2, b., pp. 513, 545, or 551, 586 Thayer, 690, 733 Moulton; and WILKE, *Hermeneutik* (1844), ii. 88.

It is interesting to notice that many scholars who had already in their publications adopted or even strongly contended for the common construction of this passage, afterwards saw reason to change their minds. Such was the case with Eckermann, De Wette, Meyer, Rückert, Bretschneider, Schott, Krehl, Hahn (perhaps both father and son); and it is so with Ritschl, as I am assured by a very intelligent student (the Rev. Alfred Gooding), who took full notes of his exegetical lectures on Romans in the semester of 1879–80. I know of only one instance of a conversion in the opposite direction, that of Dr. G. V. Lechler, who, in the first edition of his *Das apost. u. das*

achapost. Zeitalter (1851), pp. 38, 39, made the last part of the erse a doxology to God, but in the second edition (1857), p. 63 f., pplies it to Christ. He expressly admits, however, as regards the wo opposing views, that "sprachlich und logisch sind beide gleich-erechtigt."

"THE awful blindness and obstinacy of Arians and Socinians in heir perversions of this passage," says the Scotch commentator Haldane, "more fully manifest the depravity of human nature, and he rooted enmity of the carnal mind against God, than the grossest vorks of the flesh."* "The dishonest shifts," says Dean Burgon, 'by which unbelievers seek to evacuate the record which they are powerless to refute or deny, are paraded by our Revisionists in the following terms."† (Here Mr. Burgon quotes the margin of the Revised version at Rom. ix. 5, regarding these renderings as "not entitled to notice in the margin of the N. T.," and their admission as "a very grave offence.")

Σὺ τίς εἶ, ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην, ὁ κατήγωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν ;

In contrast with these utterances, not addressed to the reason of men, and not adapted to promote Christian charity or Christian humility, it is refreshing to read a discussion so calm, so clear, so fair, and so able as that of Professor Dwight.

**Exposition of the Ep. to the Romans*, Amer. reprint of the 5th Edinburgh edition, p. 454.

†*The Quarterly Review* for January, 1882, p. 54; see also the same for April, 1882, p. 370.

NOTE A.—(See p. 99.)

On the Punctuation of Rom. ix. 5 *in Ancient Manuscripts.*

In regard to the punctuation of this passage in ancient manuscripts, though the matter is in itself of little importance, it may be well to correct some current errors, especially as the supposed absence of a point after *σάρκα* in the manuscripts has been urged as an objection to the construction which makes the *ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ.* a doxology to God. For example, Dr. Gifford, the latest commentator, speaks of the stop after *σάρκα* as found simply "in two or three inferior MSS."; while Mr. Burgon, in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1882, says "*the oldest codices, besides the whole body of the cursives* [the Italics are his],

know nothing about the method of 'some modern Interpreters' [referring to the margin of the Revised Version]; and he remarks in a note, "C alone has a point between ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων and θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. But this is an entirely different thing from what is noted in the margin." (p. 54.)

The facts of the case do not accord with these statements. In the first place, C, according to Tischendorf's very careful edition of this MS. (Lips. 1843), has no point after πάντων, and there can be little doubt that such a stop exists only in Mr. Burgon's very lively imagination; it *does* have, on the other hand, as Tischendorf's edition shows, both a point and a space after σάρκα, unquestionably *a prima manu*. The Alexandrian manuscript (A) has also a point after σάρκα, as appears by Woide's edition (1786), by the recent photograph published by the British Museum (1879), and by the express testimony of Dr. Vance Smith and of Dr. Sanday, who says, "The point is clearly marked, and it is evidently by the first hand." (*The Expositor*, Sept., 1879; x. 235.) This fact has been overlooked both by Tischendorf, and by Westcott and Hort. There is, moreover, a point after σάρκα in the Vatican manuscript (B), which, though it does not appear in the Roman edition, is amply attested by Dr. Vance Smith from personal inspection (*The Expositor*, May, 1879, ix. 399, comp. his *The Spirit and the Word of Christ*, Lond., 1874, p. 138), and by others. This point also, from the description of it, seems to be probably by the first hand, though more careful examination and comparison may be required to settle the question.* The Clermont MS. (D) ends a stichometric line at σάρκα, but

*The facts as to the Vatican MS. are these. Tischendorf, who has given the most careful attention to its palæography, states that "ipsam primam manum passim, in nonnullis libris haud raro interpunxisse, sine ulla dubitatione asseverandum est." (*N. T. Vat.* p. xx.; comp. p. xxi.) The later hand, of the tenth or eleventh century, has but rarely supplied points. (*Ibid.*) The original scribe indicates a pause, sometimes by a small space simply; sometimes by such a space with a point, and sometimes by a point with a *very* small space between the letters or none at all. Of the latter there are two unquestionable examples by the first hand in Tischendorf's facsimiles, made from parts of the MS. which, having been accidentally repeated, were wholly untouched by the corrector and freshener of the ink, namely, after the word ὀφειλημα in Rom. iv. 4 (cod. p. 1448), where there is no space, and after ζειτει in 2 Cor. iii. 15 (cod. p. 1479), where the space is exceedingly small. Tischendorf was unable to examine carefully the punctuation of the MS. beyond the end of the Gospel of Luke; but he observed that punctuation was much more frequent in the Epistles than in the Gospels. I notice that in the Roman edition there are 12 points on the page (p. 1453) that contains Rom. ix. 5, extending from Rom. viii. 23 (εχου)τες to μηπω γαρ ix. 11, inclusive. There is no extra space after σάρκα, but perhaps that does not diminish the probability that the point is by the first hand. There is no extra space, as we have seen, after ὀφειλημα in Rom. iv. 4; and Tischendorf observes (*Nov. Test. Sin.* p. xix.) that there

his does not determine the construction of what follows. The Sinaitic MS. has only a single point (after *ουτως* Rom. ix. 20) in the whole page containing the passage, 4 cols. of 48 lines each, from Rom. viii. 38 *ουτε ενεστωτα* to *αγνοουντες* x. 3, inclusive. It is therefore neutral. The same s true for a different reason of F and G, in which the numerous points re distributed in the most arbitrary manner, so that, although they each have a point after *σάρκα*, it counts for nothing. We have no report of K, collated by Matthaei, who does not record the punctuation of MSS. L, the remaining uncial, has a point after *σάρκα* according to Tischendorf. There is no break between *ο ων* and *αμην* in A B C.

As to the cursive MSS., their punctuation has been very rarely noted by collators. The sweeping statement of Mr. Burgon is made entirely at random. But a point after *σάρκα* is found in at least six cursives, viz. No. 5 (collated by Scholz), 47 (by Griesbach), 71, 77, 80, and 89 (by Birch); also in the beautiful Greek Praxapostolos or Lectionary of the welfth century belonging to the Library of Harvard College (pp. 150, 51), and the fine Lectionary in the Astor Library (p. 117), assigned to he eleventh century (?), formerly in the possession of the Duke of Sussex. In the Harvard Lectionary there is also a point after *θεός*, which is not the case in the Astor Library manuscript.* A point has also been noted after *θεός* in 17 (Griesb.), and after *πάντων* in 71 (Birch).

Incorrect statements are often made in regard to the extreme rarity of punctuation in our oldest N. T. MSS. I therefore note the fact, that on he page of the Alexandrian MS. (A) which contains our passage, extending from Rom. viii. 21 *αλλα δια τον υποταξαντα* to *προθεσις του θυ ιεν* . . ix. 11, there are 64 points in Woide's edition; in the Ephrem MS. (C) from Rom. viii. 27 *ο δε ερευνων* to *αμην* ix. 5 in Tischendorf's edition there are 45 points; for B see above. In the three pages of Paul's Epistles in B published by Tischendorf line for line in his

---

are points with no space in the Sinaitic MS. after the words *πονηρια· ασωτια· πλεονεξια·* Rom. i. 29. On the page of B (1453) which contains Rom. ix. 5 there is no extra space in the printed edition with the point after *απεκδεχομεθα*, col. 1, l. 12, or after *τεκνα*, col. 3, l. 28. It will be observed that all the words which have been mentioned end with the letter A, which on account of its peculiar form in the uncial MSS. did not need any extra space for the insertion of a point after it at the top of the line, the shape of the letter necessarily leaving a space there. But the absence of extra space after the letter would render it less likely that the late corrector would insert a point after it.

It is expressly stated by a gentleman who recently examined the MS., and whose letter from Rome I have been permitted to see, that the point after *σάρκα* "is of lighter color than the adjoining letters," and that it was certainly much fainter than a point in the space after *ημων* on the same page, "which was as black as the touched letters."

*For a careful copy of that part of the Astor Library manuscript which contains Rom. ix. 4, 5, I am indebted to the kindness of the Rev. S. M. Jackson.

Appendix codd. celeb. Sin. Vat. Alex. (1867), p. 1445 (Rom. i. 1–26) ha 15 points which he regards as *a prima manu*; p. 1460 (Rom. xv. 24— xvi. 17) has 35; p. 1506 (Col. iv. 8—1 Thess. i. 8, with more than half a column blank, has 17. These pages, however, were selected partly on account of their exceptional frequency of punctuation.

The truth is, that this whole matter of punctuation in the ancien MSS. is of exceedingly small importance, which might be shown more fully, had not this paper already extended to an excessive length. In the first place, we cannot infer with confidence the construction given to the passage by the punctuator, the distribution of points even in the oldest MSS. is so abnormal; in the second place, if we could, to how much would his authority amount?

All that I have argued from the point after *σάρκα* in A B C L, &c., is that a pause after that word was felt by ancient scribes to be natural.

NOTE B. (See p. 112.)

On the Distinction between εὐλογητός and εὐλογημένος.

The distinction between *εὐλογητός* and *εὐλογημένος* is dwelt upon by Philo, *De Migr. Abrah.* c. 19, Opp. i. 453, in his remarks on Gen. xii 2. The former word, according to him, describes one who by nature or character is *worthy* of praise or blessing, *εὐλογίας ἄξιος*; the latter one who is in fact praised or blessed, whether rightfully or otherwise. In other words, *εὐλογητός*, in doxologies, would be *laudandus* or *laud dignus*; *εὐλογημένος laudatus*. So Theodore of Mopsuestia on Eph. i 3 explains *εὐλογητός* as *τοῦ ἐπαινεῖσθαι καὶ θαυμάζεσθαι ἄξιος*. (Migne *Patrol. Gr.* lxvi. 912.) It is true that in classical Greek verbals in *-τός* like the Latin participles in *-tus*, have generally a simply passive signification; but we find exceptions, particularly in the later Greek, and especially in the case of words analogous in meaning to *εὐλογητός*. See in the Lexicons *αἰνετός*, *ἐπαινετός*, *ὑπεραινετός*, *ἐγκωμιαστός*, *θαυμαστός*, *μακαριστός* (2 Macc. vii. 24), *μεμπτός*, *ψεκτός*, *μισητός*, *στυγητός*, *ὑμνητός*, *ὑπερυμνητός*. On *ἐπαινετός* and *ψεκτός* see Philo *ubi supra*. (See also Kühner, *Ausführl. Gram.*, 2te Aufl., i. 716. This view is confirmed by the fact that we never find *εὐλογητός* used like *εὐλογημένος* with *εἴη* or *ἔστω*; wherever the verb is expressed with *εὐλογητός* it is always in the indicative. For example, in Rom. i. 25 *τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, it is surely more natural to take *εὐλογητός* as signifying "to be praised," *laudandus*, than actually "praised," *laudatus*. See Fritzsche and Van Hengel *in loc.*, the latter of whom cites the passage of Philo referred to above. So in other

ologies we find the indicative, εὐλογητός εἶ, Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 12; lith xiii. 17; Tob. iii. 11; viii. 5, 15, 16, 17; xi. 13; Orat. Azar. 2; Cant. im puer. (Fritzsche), 28, 30, 31, 32, 33; 1 Esdr. iv. 60; 1 Macc. iv. 20; nst. Apost. vii. 34, 49; Act. Phil. c. 26; Lit. S. Jac. in Hammond's *tient Liturgies* (Oxford, 1878), pp. 25, 26, 28, 31, 33, 38, 39, 53, 54; . Const. (Anaph. S. Chrys.), p. 119; (Anaph. S. Basil.) p. 128; Lit. S. rci, p. 179; and so ὁ ὢν εὐλογητός, 2 Cor. xi. 31; Lit. S. Marci, pp. , 192. This is the view of many excellent scholars besides Fritzsche l Van Hengel; as Erasmus, Beza (on Mark xiv. 61), Crell on Rom. 5, Tholuck, Rückert, and the lexicographers Schleusner, Wahl, Bretneider, and Robinson. On the other side there are indeed very emit names, as Grimm in his *Lex.*, Meyer, De Wette and Philippi on m. i. 25, and Harless on Eph. i. 3, but I find no argument in any of em except Harless, and his arguments seem to me of little weight. ey rest mainly on the assumption that εὐλογητός is taken to mean ne who *must* be praised" instead "one to whom praise is *due*." That latter conception of God may naturally be expressed in a doxology shown by Rev. iv. 11, ἄξιος εἶ, ὁ κύριος καὶ θεὸς ἡμῶν, λαβεῖν τὴν ξαν, κ. τ. λ.; comp. Rev. v. 12. See also Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum*, Galura, ii. 186 (S. Bonifatius, § 12), ὅτι σοι πρέπει τιμὴ κ. τ. λ., and 62 (SS. Tarachus, Probus, *etc.* § 11), ὅτι αὐτῷ πρέπει δόξα κ. τ. λ.; nst. Ap. vii. 48; Act. Barn. c. 26; Act. Joh. c. 22; Protev. Jac. c. 25, MSS.; Act. Pil. A. c. 16, § 8, MSS.; Narr. Jos. c. 5, § 4. I accordly agree with Buttmann, *N. T. Gram.* p. 120 (137 Thayer), that in doxgies with εὐλογητός we are to supply ἐστίν rather than εἴη or ἔστω. e sentence is therefore, in these cases, grammatically considered, clarative, not optative, though the whole *effect* of the original is perps better given by rendering "be blessed" than "is to be praised." mpare further 1 Pet. iv. 11; Matt. vi. 13 (text. rec.); Clem. Rom. *Ep. Cor.* c. 58 (new addit.; *contra*, c. 32); and see Lightfoot's note on l. i. 5.

We must notice the difference in meaning, not affecting however the sition of the words, between εὐλογητός in the Septuagint when applied men, as in Gen. (xii. 2, variante lectione) xxiv. 31 (v. l.); xxvi. 29 (v. l.); eut. vii. 14; (xxviii. 6, v. l.; xxxiii. 24, v. l.); Judg. xvii. 2 (v. l.); 1 Sam. 13 (v. l.); Judith xiii. 18 (v. l.); Tob. xi. 16 (in one text), and when plied to God. In the former case it is used in the sense of "prosred," "blessed" (viz. by God), and is to be taken, probably, in a simply ssive sense; εὐλογημένος often occurs as a various reading. As aped to God, I believe Philo's distinction holds good. In the particular se, however, to which he refers, Gen. xii. 2, where he reads εὐλογητός many other authorities, see Holmes), applied to Abraham, his expoion is fanciful. In several cases the terms may seem to be intentiony distinguished; see Gen. xiv. 19, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33; Tob. xi. 16 .; *contra*, Judith xiii. 18.

One other remark may be made. In speaking of εὐλογητός and simila words in "exclamatory doxologies" (see above, pp. 31–39), we mu guard against a fallacy. "Exclamatory" as applied to sentences denot a characteristic which exists in very different degrees in different case where one printer would use a mark of exclamation, another wou often put a period. Because the placing of such a predicate as εὐλογητ first in the sentence gives or tends to give it an exclamatory characte we cannot straightway draw the inference that in *all* doxologies which the verb is omitted εὐλογητός, if used, must have the first plac One may admit that in exclamatory doxologies εὐλογητός always stan first, and deny that the doxology in Rom. ix. 5 is exclamatory. Th elliptical word I suppose to be ἐστί, as in most at least of the claus immediately preceding.

CORRECTION.

The statement on p. 108 about the reading of the ancient versio in Gen. xxvi. 29 lacks precision. The versions made directly fro the Hebrew, of course, do not come under consideration. Of tho made from the Septuagint, the Armenian, the Georgian, and the O Slavic (Cod. Ostrog.) support σὺ εὐλογ.; the Ethiopic, εὐλογ. σύ; t Old Latin has perished; and the Coptic, as I am informed by Pro T. O. Paine, omits the last clause of the verse.

Examination of Exodus xxxiii. 7-11.

BY PROF. C. M. MEAD, PH. D.

This passage has occasioned much perplexity and discussion. The ifficulty is a very obvious one, when the passage is considered in onnection with the context. In chh. xxiv.–xxxi. we have the ccount of Moses' being called up into the mount, and there receiv- g directions concerning the building of the tabernacle. In ch. xxii. is narrated how the people, during Moses' long delay, had ade them a golden calf, and how Moses, after administering reproof nd chastisement, returned to Jehovah to intercede for the people. n ch. xxxiii. 1–3, Jehovah renews his promise that the people shall o to the land of Canaan, and says, "I will send an angel before ee and I will drive out the Canaanite," etc. . . . "for I will ot go up in the midst of thee: for thou art a stiffnecked people; st I consume thee in the way." In consequence of this utterance, is said (ver. 4) that "the people mourned, and no man did put on im his ornaments." Then, in ver. 5, we have an apparent repeti- on of ver. 3, "And Jehovah said unto Moses, Say unto the children f Israel, Ye are a stiffnecked people; should I for one moment go p in the midst of thee, I should consume thee: and now put off thy rnaments from thee, that I may know what I will do with thee." his command to put off the ornaments, coming after the statement at the people did not put them on, seems to be out of place. The . V. accordingly renders, "For the Lord *had said* unto Moses," etc. Ve are not warranted in so translating, though often the Vav Consec- tive introduces a verb which is not consecutive to the foregoing in a rictly chronological sense. But inasmuch as ver. 5 is a repetition nd enlargement of ver. 3, and is followed (ver. 6) by the statement, And the children of Israel stripped themselves of their ornaments om Mt. Horeb on," we are compelled to hold that vers. 5 and 6 are substantial repetition of the foregoing, with the addition that the ying off of the ornaments was in direct consequence of a divine

command, even though we assume, with some, that we have here two distinct narratives loosely put together. But, at the worst, no serious difficulty need be found here. It is when we come to the following five verses that the real puzzle is presented. After this statement about Jehovah's threat and the people's humiliation, as indicated by their not wearing their ornaments from this time on, we read (according to the usual rendering), "And Moses took the tent, and pitched it without the camp, and called it the Tent of Meeting. And it came to pass, when Moses went out unto the tent, that all the people rose up and stood, every man at his tent door, and looked after Moses until he was gone into the tent. And it came to pass, as Moses entered into the tent, the pillar of cloud descended, and stood at the door of the tent; and all the people rose up and worshipped, every man at his tent door. And Jehovah spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend. And he turned again into the camp: but his servant, Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tent."

The difficulties presented by this passage are two: (1) It speaks of the Tent of Meeting (A. V., "tabernacle of the congregation") as of a structure already erected, whereas, according to the rest of the book, it was as yet only projected, but not built; (2) the passage interrupts the narrative of ch. xxxiii. itself; for ver. 12 seqq. is a direct continuation of the communication between Jehovah and Moses; and vers. 7–11 have (as usually understood) no visible connection with it.

The first of these difficulties those who hold to the unity of authorship, or at least consistency of authorship, have attempted to solve in two ways: (*a*) Some have thought that the tent here spoken of was Moses' own tent, which he now set apart provisionally for sacred purposes until the permanent structure should be completed. But it is hard to see why, if Moses' private tent was intended, it should not have been called "*his* tent" instead of "*the* tent." Moreover, the following verses represent Moses as being only occasionally in this tent, *i. e.* only for the purpose of special communication with Jehovah. Where was he to eat and sleep? What was to be his ordinary dwelling-place? This difficulty is evaded, not met, when Keil translates "*a* tent," and says that it was a tent of Moses which, on account of the divine revelations made in it, became a provisional tabernacle. If the meaning is that it was one of Moses' tents, then, to say nothing of the fact that it is a pure assumption to suppose that he had several tents of his own, the use of the definite article is unaccountable. If he had but one tent, the definite article would be less objectionable,

ough even then very strange; but if he had several, and this was ly one, such a construction is quite inadmissible.

(*b*) The other explanation is that the tent here mentioned was a ictuary which from the first had been used as a central place of rship, and is therefore familiarly called "the tent." The obvious jection to this is, that there is no previous reference to any such struc- re, and it seems singular that in the first place where it is entioned it should be called simply "the tent." Moreover, the ragraph before us produces the impression that this was the begin- ng of the religious use made of this tent. It was now taken and ched outside of the camp, and called the tent of meeting. It ay, indeed, be urged that it is intrinsically probable that there had en some sanctuary from the first; but this narrative can be made to fer to such a sanctuary only by a very strained exegesis.

But these interpretations, while they, if otherwise admissible, move the first difficulty—the absurdity of telling what was done th a building not yet erected—do not at all relieve the second one, e interruption of the account of Moses' conversation with Jehovah. hen Moses says (ver. 12), "See, thou sayest unto me, Bring up is people; and thou hast not let me know whom thou wilt send with e," there is a manifest and direct reference to Jehovah's promise (ver. that "an angel" should go before them. Moses is grieved because hovah himself refuses to go with them, and only sends an unknown gel; and he intercedes for a modification of the divine sentence. ow, in the midst of this negotiation is inserted the account of what oses did with this unknown tent. No one can reasonably suppose at it describes what happened at this time; it is commonly under- ood to describe a customary use made of the tent; but there is viously not only no reason for interjecting the account here, but e best of all reasons why it should not have been interjected, viz., at it has nothing to do with the things related in the context, and excusably interrupts the narrative. And these conjectures about hat this tent was—conjectures at the best without any positive sup- rt, and such as would never have been thought of except for the achronism respecting the real tabernacle—do not at all relieve us regards the incongruity between this passage and the rest of the apter. On any theory of the authorship of the Exodus, here is a ry serious difficulty. Such a causeless breach of continuity is quite thout parallel; and the least that can be said of the paragraph in uestion (as commonly understood) is that it is misplaced. And this ings us to a third theory respecting the difficulty in question.

(*c*) It is held that these five verses refer to the same tabernacle as

the one elsewhere more largely described, but that they are by a differen
author, and are here inserted out of place. In confirmation of thi
view, we are pointed to discrepancies between this account of th
tabernacle and the more detailed one, besides the one already noticed
Thus it is observed that, according to the passage before us, the onl
use made of the tabernacle was its occasional occupation by Mose
in order to receive divine communications, whereas elsewhere little o
nothing is said about Moses' being in it, the chief use of it bein
sacerdotal. Again, according to the section before us, Joshua was t
remain permanently in the tent; whereas, according to the other ac
counts (Num. i. 51, iii. 10, 38, xviii. 7, 22), only Aaron and his descend
ants were allowed to enter it. Furthermore, the tabernacle is here sai
to be outside of the camp, whereas later (Num. ii. 17) the tabernacl
is located in the midst of the camp. These discrepancies are though
to betray the hand of a different writer in the passage before us fron
that of the author of the other accounts.

This hypothesis, however, not only does nothing to relieve the firs
difficulty, the anachronism respecting the tabernacle, but leaves th
second of the difficulties entirely untouched. The differences in th
conception of the tabernacle might indeed be thus explained; but i
is still left unexplained how the compiler of the book should eve
have been led to insert this narrative in this place. That he migh
sometimes disregard or overlook discrepancies of a minor sort, in
putting together writings of different authors, rather than dissect and
distort the writings, is very conceivable. But there is everywher
manifest such a disposition to construct an orderly and on the whol
self-consistent history, that so glaring an anachronism and contradic
tion as is here presented is without parallel and without excuse. He
could not have been ignorant of the fact that the tabernacle which he
now describes as in existence had, according to the other documents,
not yet been built. Moreover, he must have seen that the presen
place is in every way a most inappropriate one for introducing it
inasmuch as it interrupts in an utterly impertinent and irrele
vant manner the account of Moses' communication with Jehovah.
When we consider how freely, on the ordinary theory of compilation,
the writings of the various original authors were chopped up and
patched together, sometimes so that one-half of a verse is assigned to
one author and all of the context to another, there would seem to be
no conceivable reason why the redactor should not here, when the
occasion was so urgent, have either omitted this paragraph, or else
have reserved it for a later time when it would have been in place.

It is therefore no material relief to assume that this whole section

(xxxii.-xxxiv.) about the golden calf and Moses' intercession being Jehovistic, the redactor finding it in this shape did not care to detach any part of it from the rest, notwithstanding the glaring discrepancy which was thus introduced into the history. But even if this did afford some relief, there would remain unexplained why the Jehovist himself should have put together his own material in such a way as this; for, as we have seen, irrespective of the anachronism between xxxiii. 7–11 and the longer account of the tabernacle, this section is out of place even as related to its immediate context. Dillmann, feeling this difficulty, attributes these verses (xxxiii. 7–11) not to the Jehovist, but to the younger Elohist, to whom he also attributes mainly the first six verses also. But this is only shifting the trouble, not removing it; it rather increases it. For if the redactor had two or three narratives to make his compilation from; if Ex. xxxiii. 7–11 was not a constituent and original part of the whole section xxxii-xxxiv; then the wonder is all the greater why the redactor should have put together the narratives of different authors so as to create such palpable confusion and contradiction, when it would have been just as easy, and every way more sensible, to insert this short paragraph, if at all, in a place where it chronologically belongs. If it is supposed that the redactor himself is not responsible for this arrangement, but found these five verses from the younger Elohist already incorporated with the Jehovist's account of the golden calf, etc., then this only raises the question, How did such incorporation *ever* take place? *Some one* must have put together the two things in this absurd way; and go back as far as we may in our conjectures, the difficulty remains the same, and remains unsolved. There is every presumption against such a historical account of the use of the tabernacle having been interpolated into this narrative of the negotiation between Jehovah and Moses.

Delitzsch, in the second of his recent articles on the Pentateuch, which treats of the tabernacle, ranks himself among those who assume that the tabernacle of this passage is the same as the one previously described, and that this passage is from a different author from that of the other and more detailed account of the tabernacle. He thinks that the one wrote without any purpose of supplementing the other, and that the two accounts were put together by a redactor who must have had some desire to harmonize them. "Probably," says he, "he was led by this desire to give this abruptly-beginning section its present position, so that the putting of the sacred tent out of the camp, and far away from it, appears as a penal consequence of the people's sin of apostasy." This suggestion is an approach towards what I

regard as the true solution. But it does not remove the difficulties already set forth. If the redactor was influenced by a harmonistic intent here, he had very poor success in the execution of it, since, by representing Moses as removing the tabernacle at this juncture, he brings this account into the flattest contradiction with the other accounts of the tabernacle, according to which the sanctuary was not yet erected. That the removal of the tabernacle from the midst of the camp, might have served as a punishment of the people's apostasy, is very true, provided there was a tabernacle in existence; but, inasmuch as according to the rest of the book, there was none as yet, and the redactor himself has given us to understand the fact, it seems almost like satire to speak of him as attempting to harmonize the different accounts by representing the people as punished by the removal of a non-existent tabernacle. Besides all this, there remains untouched the other difficulty, that the section in question is utterly incongruous with the immediate context.

One other explanation may be mentioned, that of those who hold (*d*) that the detailed account of the tabernacle is a fiction, and that the tent in the narrative before us is a real tent, in which the ark was kept. This is the view *e. g.* of Graf, who holds moreover that the Elohistic account of the tabernacle is later than the one before us. He explains the position of the longer narratives of the tabernacle with reference to Ex. xxxiii. 7–11 as follows: "It was occasioned by the mention of the אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד in xxxiii. 7 sqq.; but the direction to build had been given to Moses on the mount, and therefore belonged to the place where his forty days' stay on the mount was told of, xxiv. 18; the execution of the command, however, had to be preceded by that which was immediately connected with his descent from the mount, xxxii.–xxxiv.; therefore the description of the structure was inserted immediately before the laws which were to be given before setting out from Sinai, with which laws this description was closely connected (*Geschichtliche Bücher des A. T.* p. 60)." But this solution is as inadequate as the others to meet the real difficulties. The whole value of it depends upon the shrewdness of the critic's guess as to the reason why these narratives are arranged as they are; but even if we assume the guess to be a shrewd one, the relief is the slightest possible. By assuming the Elohistic account to be a pure fiction we do indeed in one sense explain how the two accounts are inconsistent with one another; but inasmuch as the redactor is supposed to have had an intelligent motive in his work, the problem is not solved till we can discover both intelligence and motive. Graf has assigned a

motive, but it is at the expense of the redactor's intelligence. The redactor is supposed to have inserted the Elohistic directions concerning the tabernacle before this Jehovistic section (xxxii.–xxxiv.) for the reason that in the latter the Tent of Meeting is mentioned, and it is mentioned in the account of what happened immediately after Moses' descent from the mount, where the directions were given. Therefore, it is further assumed that the actual erection of the tabernacle is put after this Jehovistic narrative for the reason that immediately after Moses' descent there had been no time for the work of building. In other words, because in this Jehovistic section the tabernacle is spoken of as an existent fact, therefore the redactor puts the Elohistic account of the command to build it before this mention, but puts the Elohistic account of the actual building of it after the Jehovistic account which speaks of it as already built! This, then, is the solution of the first difficuty—a solution which is attained by assuming the fictitiousness of one of the narratives, the inconsistency of the fictitious narrative with the older historical one, the agency of a redactor in putting the two together as one whole, and the egregious stupidity of the redactor in that he, in doing his best to weave the narratives together, gives us to understand that the tabernacle was not built until after it had been used! As to the second difficulty, this explanation, like all the others, simply leaves it untouched.

But perhaps enough has been said in setting forth the difficulties under which the ordinary theories labor. Yet it is important to present these clearly, in order the better to justify a new attempt. Especially would I insist on the second of the two difficulties as one challenging more attention than it has yet received. As already observed, ver. 12 is immediately connected with vers. 1–6. It is manifestly a continuation of the narrative respecting Jehovah's communication with Moses. That these five verses (7–11) cannot (as Keil seems to hold) describe what happened in the course of this communication is so obvious that it hardly needs demonstration. The simple fact that these verses (if historical at all) manifestly narrate something that was customary, is the conclusive refutation of any such notion. This being so, the only refuge, on the ordinary theories, is to assume that these verses are misplaced. But how or why these verses should ever have become placed here, is more than any one has ever discovered. No parallel to such a misplacement can anywhere be found, unless perhaps the account of the adulteress in John viii. is such an instance. But that passage, whatever may be true respecting its authenticity, is without the support of good manuscript authority in this place, whereas the oldest versions and MSS. fail to

cast any suspicion on the passage in Exodus. The presumption is that the passage is in the right place. Not until it is proved impossible to justify its present position, should we resort to the hypothesis that it belongs elsewhere.

Let us now see if there is not a solution which meets both of these difficulties, and not merely one; and a solution which does not, like the most of those considered, increase the embarrassment more than it relieves it. Such a solution, as I conceive, is suggested by the remarkable fact that the verbs in this section are *Future verbs throughout*, or, what is the same thing, Perfects with the Vav Consecutive. This fact, not at all noticed by most commentators, is casually alluded to by some as an instance of the Future used to denote a customary past action. The idea that the verbs may be actual Futures seems not to have occurred to any of them. And yet the presumption is greatly in favor of so translating them. The Imperfect, in historical narration, is always to be rendered by the Future, unless there is evidence to the contrary. In the present case what is the evidence to the contrary? Whatever that evidence may be, is it strong enough to compel us to translate the passage in such a way as to involve us in the serious perplexities which have been shown to beset the ordinary translation? Are not these grave enough to warrant us in translating the passage in the simplest and grammatically most natural way, unless we are thus landed in still greater difficulties? Certain it is that by rendering these verbs as Futures we remove at one stroke the two difficulties which have been considered. By so understanding them we simply make these verses, not a statement of what was done with an existing tabernacle, but a divine direction concerning what should be done with the future tabernacle. They are made, in short, to be the continuation of the language of Jehovah contained in ver. 5. Let us now substantiate this view more particularly.

A word first as to the grammatical question. It is of course not to be denied that the Imperfect is often used with reference to past actions. But in prose such instances are rare, and are, so far as I know, nowhere else kept up through so long a section as this; and where they are so used, the reference to repeated or habitual actions is clear. In the present case, it is true, many of the verbs might be understood as describing a customary action; but not all, and notably not the first three, can easily be so understood. It would be unnatural to translate, "And Moses used to take the tent, and used to pitch it without the camp, and used to call it the tent of meeting." These verbs apparently denote single actions; and what reason could

the writer have had for using the Future tense? It is reasonable to insist strongly on this fact, and to claim that the original presumption in favor of the Future rendering is redoubled in force by the absence of any assignable reason for using the Future tense at the opening of this section, unless the writer meant the verbs to describe something really future.

In addition to the grammatical consideration, now, we find that this construction relieves us of the whole difficulty arising from the apparent anachronism. The passage now does not imply that the tabernacle is already constructed, but it is only a direction what to do with it when it shall be constructed. We are under no necessity, therefore, of inventing a sanctuary, antecedent to the real tabernacle, and yet bearing the same name; or of supposing that Moses had to be turned out of house and home, in order to provide a place for religious worship. The Tent of Meeting is the same here as in the preceding chapters—in both cases something that is yet to be. We are also under no necessity of accounting for contradictions by assuming plurality and inconsistency in the authorship of the different narratives. If it be said that there are other marks of diverse authorship besides the anachronism and the apparent misplacement, it is enough to reply that the interpretation which I propose leaves room for as many authors as any one chooses to assume; only it does not require us to find so much contradiction between the different authors as has been heretofore found. If it is held that, in maintaining the theory of plurality of authorship, it is important to make the disagreements as great as possible, instead of seeking, so far as can be done reasonably, to reconcile them, then that may be regarded as an objection to the proposed interpretation. But I am not aware, though this seems to be the principle practically followed by many critics, that it has yet become an established canon of hermeneutics.

The presumption is that the tent called אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד is the same thing here as in the preceding chapters. On any theory but the one now propounded, these five verses appear to be entirely inexplicable. But regarded as a direction concerning what should be done, they are perfectly appropriate and intelligible where they stand. Moses had been told to say unto the people that Jehovah would not go up in the midst of them. They were commanded to put off their ornaments, that Jehovah might know what he would do unto them. In ver. 6 we are parenthetically told that the command was complied with; and then, in vers. 7–11, we are further told what Jehovah did decide to

do with them. Having declared that he could not go up in the *midst* of the people, he determines to indicate this symbolically by requiring that the Tent of Meeting, which Moses has received orders to have constructed, and which was to serve as the place of Jehovah's manifestation of himself, should be pitched, not in the *midst* of the camp, but far off, *outside* of it. Jehovah was to be distant from the people; they were to be reminded of their sin by the location of the tabernacle. These verses, instead of being an unaccountable interruption of the context, are thus in perfect keeping with it.

Not only are these two most pressing difficulties removed by this interpretation, but also the apparent discrepancies which have been mentioned between this account of the tabernacle and the other accounts of it are relieved, if not entirely done away. Thus, what is said about Joshua's remaining in the tabernacle creates a difficulty at the worst no greater when the verbs are rendered as Futures than when they are rendered as Preterites. In fact, the discrepancy is relieved. As now translated, these verses express a threat simply, and a threat which, as the following verses show, was not fulfilled. Moses' intercession (ver. 12–16) secures from Jehovah the promise (ver. 17), "I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken, for thou hast found grace in my sight." It might be said, then, that everything in this account of the tabernacle which appears to conflict with the other descriptions of its use, may be explained as a part of a threat never carried out, so that the discrepancy falls of itself. Still, as may be reasonably urged, the discrepancy respecting Joshua has been unduly magnified. The passages which forbid any but the priests to come nigh the tabernacle have reference, as Num. xvi. 40 clearly intimates, to those who come for the purpose of exercising sacerdotal functions. Moses, at all events, though not a son of Aaron, could, according to the Elohist, enter the tabernacle and there commune with Jehovah (Ex. xxv. 22, xxix. 42; xxx. 6, 36); and he is associated with Aaron and the priests in the arrangement of the encampment with reference to the tabernacle (Num. iii. 38). Now, Aaron having become himself implicated in the people's sin, it may be regarded as a part of the penalty imposed, that he is not to enter the tabernacle. That Joshua, as Moses' confidential attendant, should be with him in the tabernacle, is no stranger than that he should accompany him to the mount when he was to commune with Jehovah (Ex. xxiv. 13, xxxii. 17).

A similar remark applies to the discrepancy respecting the use made of the tabernacle. In Ex. xxxiii. 7–11 it appears to be only an oracle; nothing is said about priests or sacrifices. If Aaron, as an

accomplice in the sin of the people, was to suffer punishment with them, this would explain the absence of all mention of him. And the revocation of the threat removes all the discrepancy in any case; for even the Elohistic narrative speaks of the tabernacle as a place where God was to meet with Moses (Ex. xxv. 22) and with the people (xxix. 43).

In like manner, the difference relative to the location of the tabernacle disappears, when it is considered that the command to put it outside of the camp symbolizes Jehovah's refusal to go up in the midst of the people. If, as is the fact, this refusal was revoked, then that the tabernacle should afterwards be spoken of as in the midst of the camp is just what is to be expected.*

It thus appears that all the difficulties which have beset the passage under consideration are either wholly removed or greatly lessened, while none of them are increased by the proposed translation. It would seem, then, that an interpretation so simple as this, one favored by grammatical idiom, and one that solves the puzzles that are created by the ordinary translation, ought to be adopted unless there are very weighty objections to it. What, then, can be said against it?

1. It may be said that ver. 6 being a historical statement, the presumption is that the language of Jehovah ends with ver. 5.—It is sufficient to reply that, though there may be such a presumption, there are yet so many instances of similar parenthetical construction, that the objection is anything but decisive. Thus, in Ex. iv. 4, 5, we read, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Put forth thy hand, and take it by the tail. And he put forth his hand, and caught it, and it became a rod in his hand: that they may believe that the Lord God of their fathers . . . . hath appeared unto thee." A precisely simi-

* It may be objected to this that the discrepancy as to the location of the tabernacle is not confined to the passage before us, but recurs in Num. xi. 24 30, in the narrative concerning Eldad and Medad, where it is said of them (ver. 26) that they "remained in the camp" and "went not out unto the tabernacle." Also in Num. xii. 4 Moses, Aaron, and Miriam are commanded to "come out unto the tabernacle of the congregation." These passages, it must be admitted, make the impression that the tabernacle was outside of the camp. But these expressions might be used of those who went out of their tents to the tabernacle, even though the tabernacle was in the centre of the encampment, especially if it was separated by a considerable distance from the surrounding tents. This is confirmed by the fact that in xi. 24 it is said of Moses that he "went out, and told the people the words of the Lord," where, whether the going out was from the tabernacle, where Moses had been receiving the divine communications, (Keil), or from his own tent (Knobel), it certainly does not mean that he went out of the camp. In Ex. xxxiii. 7 the word מִחוּץ is used; this is explicit; nothing of the sort is found in Numbers.

lar construction occurs in Ex. iv. 7, 8. Cf. also Matt. ix. 6, Mark ii. 10, Luke v. 24. In these cases the interruption of the grammatical construction is perhaps even more disturbing than in the one before us. It is not at all unnatural that, in immediate connection with the command concerning the ornaments, it should be parenthetically remarked that the command was obeyed. This objection, therefore, is, at the most, of little weight.

2. Again, it may be objected that, if these verses are the continuation of Jehovah's address to Moses, then Moses ought to be addressed in the second person, and Jehovah ought to speak of himself in the first, whereas both Moses and Jehovah are here spoken of in the third person. This is doubtless the chief thing which has made this section appear to be a historical statement rather than a direction concerning the future. This grammatical fact by itself certainly does favor the common translation. But every Hebrew scholar knows how frequent, and often how very abrupt, the changes of person are in that language. See a parallel construction in Ex. xxiv. 1, 2. Indeed, in the verses immediately preceding we have an illustration of this. Jehovah commands Moses to say to the people, "Ye are a stiffnecked people; should *I* go up in the midst of thee, I should consume thee." This, taken strictly, would represent Moses as the consuming one. And, what is more to the point, inasmuch as what Moses is told to say to the people has the form of a direct address of God to the people, it is in fact in perfect consistency with this, if not indeed required by it, that Moses should be spoken of in the third person. The only really strange thing is, therefore, that Jehovah should be spoken of in the third person, and not continue to use the first. But examples of this idiom are extremely numerous. *E. g.*, xxxiv. 10–26 we find that Jehovah, in a series of commands addressed to the people, repeatedly speaks of himself as a third person. Thus (ver. 14), "Thou shalt worship no other god; for Jehovah, whose name is jealous, is a jealous God." This circumstance, therefore, of a change of persons is by no means a serious objection to the proposed construction.

3. It may be said that, if ver. 7 is a continuation of ver. 5, the verb in the Perfect with the Vav Consecutive should precede the subject, whereas the subject now stands first, with the verb following in the Imperfect. This objection (which has been privately urged by some to whom the proposed translation has been presented) I fail to see the force of. That ordinarily the subject follows the verb is very true; but here the verb certainly does follow the subject; and this position of it is no more difficult to explain on one theory than on

another. That the verb may be Jussive here is shown by the precisely parallel constructions in Gen. i. 20, 22, where Jussive verbs, following a Jussive or Imperative, are placed after the subject. If it is asked why the subject here precedes the verb, the answer must be either that the clause is a circumstantial one, or that an emphasis lies on the subject. Against the former explanation, it must be objected that circumstantial clauses should have some obvious relation to the context, whereas these verses (if historical) have none. If they described something which happened at this time, something which illustrates or explains the context, we might naturally call them circumstantial, though even then the use of the Imperfect at the outset would be unaccountable. But, as all agree, they do not describe what happened at that time, nor anything that it is important to mention as an elucidation of the context. In order to secure even any appearance of connection of thought, we are obliged to read into the passage what is not in the faintest manner suggested by it. Thus it might be imagined that the author, while telling of Moses' conference with Jehovah, was led to think of the tabernacle in which the conference took place, and threw in at that point this bit of historical information about it. But why interject this information into the very midst of the narrative? Why not at least wait till the close of the account of the conference? And then especially, why not intimate in some manner that the conference really did take place in the tabernacle? The one thing which alone would justify, or at least in some degree account for, such an interruption of the narrative, is wholly omitted. The case of ver. 6, as related to the context, is quite different. It is an interruption, indeed, in one sense; but it has an obvious connection with the context. It is, moreover, not a circumstantial clause, for it is connected with the foregoing by the Vav Consecutive.—We must, then, account for the position of the subject of the sentence by regarding it as emphatic. There may, indeed, appear to be no special need of emphasis here; but there is certainly as much as in Gen. i. 20, 22, above referred to, or as in Gen. iv. 18. The contrast is between the people who (ver. 5) are punished for their sin, and Moses, who, not having been implicated in their sin, is to enjoy the privilege of peculiar intimacy with Jehovah.

4. One more objection may be urged, viz., that there is a particularity of detail in the passage before us, which seems more appropriate as belonging to a historical narrative than as belonging to a direction or a threat, especially if, as in the present case, the threat is not to be carried out, and is revoked even before being communicated to

the people whom it concerns. This is to my mind the only serious objection to the interpretation above advocated. If there were not still more serious objections to the ordinary view, this might be enough to decide the verdict in favor of the historical construction of the passage. But the weight of this objection is much diminished by the following considerations. (a) No difficulty is to be found in the mere fact that the threat is not fully executed. It might *a priori* appear to be inconsistent with the divine character to suppose that God could utter a threat which he is immediately induced to retract by human intercession. But in view of the multitude of instances in which God is said to have repented of his own acts, and to have been moved by the sufferings and prayers of his children, we must relax the rigor of the speculative doubt. More particularly, we have instances of threats prophetically uttered, but retracted before being executed, *e. g.* the prophecies concerning Ahab (1 Kings xxi. 18 29), Rehoboam (2 Chron. xii. 5–12), Nineveh (Jonah iii.), and Micah's prophecy (iii. 12), declared in Jerem. xxvi. 18, 19 not to have been executed on account of the people's repentance. The difficulty, then, is not at all in the mere fact that what is here prescribed is not carried out; it is only in the fact that there is more circumstantiality in the directions than is elsewhere found in unfulfilled threats. As to this, however, it is to be remarked (b) that there is no occasion for assuming that *all* of these directions were unfulfilled. In fact, the only particular of which it can certainly be said that it was revoked is the one concerning the pitching of the tent outside of the camp. All that is said, especially, about Moses' going into it to receive divine communications was of permanent validity.

I have attempted to give full weight to all possible objections against the proposed interpretation. None of them seem to be of decisive weight, especially when compared with the much greater objections which lie against the common translation.

"The Everlasting Father."

BY REV. T. W. CHAMBERS, D. D.

In Isaiah ix. 6, 7, there is a remarkable prediction of a child who s justly to bear titles of a very extraordinary character. One of these itles is rendered in our Authorized Version, The Everlasting Father— he Hebrew being אֲבִי־עַד. The force of this phrase, it is proposed ow to consider. It is agreed by all that the first noun is in the onstruct state, and that its primary meaning is *father*. The only uestions that arise are as to the nature of the genitive and the mean- ng of the second noun.

1. An early opinion, originating with Abarbanel, and afterwards dopted by Hitzig, Knobel, and Kuenen, gives to עַד the sense of *oot*y, a meaning which it certainly has in Gen. xlix. 27, Isaiah xxxiii. 3, and Zeph. iii. 8, where, however, the connection imperatively equires it. In all other cases, nearly fifty in number, it denotes *erpetuity*. Nor is there any reason for departing from the ordinary ense here, since there is nothing in the attributes of the peaceful and ighteous Ruler to suggest that he is a plundering conqueror who eigns by violence and fills his treasury with spoils, but, on the con- rary, much that points in another direction.

2. A second rendering is that of the A. V., which retains the usual neaning of both words and makes the genitive one of attribute— Father of everlasting—Everlasting Father. Thus Gesenius, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, and Maurer. This is certainly a possible endering, since we have in Hab. (iii. 6) הַרְרֵי־עַד, where no one doubts hat the second noun represents a quality of the first, viz., perpetuity. The difficulty in adopting this view here is the fact that it gives to the ubject of the prophecy a title which is never applied to the Messiah lsewhere in the S. S., and one which it is perplexing either to ex- plain exegetically or to apply homiletically. Christ's relations to his

people are set forth in a vast variety of ways by the Sacred Writers but never by any borrowed from the paternal tie—the word *father* with all its boundless wealth of meaning, being reserved for the first person of the Godhead, the Father of all, while Messiah is over and over set forth in the New Testament as the brother of his people.

3. A third view makes the genitive one of authorship (*auctoris*).

a) Thus Grotius makes it=father of a numerous offspring.

b) The Douay version, with which Lowth agrees, identifying עַד with עוֹלָם, makes the phrase mean father of a new age, or, as the older version has it, father of the world to come. (LXX. [Alex. text πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Vulg. *Pater futuri sæculi.*)

This again is a possible rendering, but certainly not probable. For it gives to the second noun a meaning which it has nowhere else in the Scriptures, and if Isaiah had intended to convey this sense he would have used עוֹלָם which was ready at his hand. Besides, the idea thus given makes no perceptible addition either in dignity or in efficacy to what has already been ascribed to the child whose name is wonderful. If he is mighty God, he is of course father or founder of the new age just as he was of all preceding ages.

(*c*) Another modification of this view regards the phrase as showing Messiah to be the author of eternity, *i. e.*, eternal life to his people. But while this is a certain and blessed truth, and one set forth with frequency and precision in the New Testament, it is not contained in the Old, except by implication. Nor does it seem natural to interject a purely spiritual conception like this into a description which borrowing its terms from an earthly throne sets forth the inherent dignity of Messiah as a mighty, successful, peaceful and permanent monarch, the increase of whose government has no end. While the doctrine of immortality was certainly known to the ancient saints yet it was not emphasized and repeated in such a way as to render it natural to expect that it would be identified with the person of Messiah so directly and distinctly as this interpretation would make it here.

4. A fourth view is that which makes the genitive one of possession. This is an Arabic usage of very common occurrence in ancient times and modern, but in Hebrew is found very rarely, and then only in proper names, *e. g.*, Abitub אֲבִי טוֹב father of goodness, *i. e.* the good one. In Job xvii. 14, the patient man salutes the grave saying, "Corruption, thou art my father," *i. e.*, corruption possesses me. And if we render שַׁחַת by *pit*, as some contend that we always

hould, the sense is the same. If this view be adopted then we ave the phrase indicating eternity as an attribute of the Messiah. He is self-existing and ever-living—a sense which admirably accords vith the whole connection, especially the preceding clause. The prophet after saying that the future deliverer is the mighty God, pecifies one of the divine perfections, that incommunicable excellence y which Jehovah is the first cause and last end of all things. Father f eternity because it is He that gives substance and body to the con- eption of infinite duration. Duration implies something that ndures. Now God is the Being who having neither beginning of lays nor end of years gives to us the concrete meaning of the abstract tatement. And to ascribe this attribute to the Messiah, to him who s to be born as a child, is exactly in line with the rest of the marvel- ous prediction, and gives increased emphasis and meaning to the tartling collocation of human qualities and divine in the future ruler f Israel. Born in time and seated on the throne of David, he is yet he Everlasting One, whose goings forth have been from of old, even rom the days of eternity. Of the increase of his government there hall be no end, just because of his existence there has been no eginning.

Finally, whatever be the meaning of the phrase, the English trans- ation should be "father of eternity" in accordance witth the ancient Arabic and the modern (Dr. Van Dyck's), the Syriac, ancient* and nodern, the Chaldee Paraphrase, the French of Martin and the Dutch f the States Bible.

*That is, in the Ambrosian Codex, for the text in the London Polyglott mits the first word of the phrase and reads "mighty God of eternity."

The Relation of Ezekiel to the Levitical Law

BY PROF. FREDERIC GARDINER, D. D.

In the discussions which have arisen of late years about the origin and date of the Mosaic legislation it has been generally recognized that the book of Ezekiel, especially in its later chapters, has a peculiar importance. The traditional view regards the laws of the Pentateuch as having been given through Moses to the Israelites soon after their Exodus from Egypt, and as having formed in all subsequent ages their more or less perfectly observed standard of ecclesiastical law and religious ceremonial; the view of several modern critics, on the other hand, is that this legislation was of gradual development, having its starting point, indeed, quite far back in the ages of Israel's history, but reaching its full development only in the times succeeding the Babylonian exile. Especially, the exclusive limitation of the functions of the priesthood to the Aaronic family, and the distinction between the priests and their brethren of the tribe of Levi, as well as the cycle of the feasts and other like matters, are held by these critics to be of post-exilic origin.

The writings of a priest who lived during the time of the exile, and who devotes a considerable part of his book to an ideal picture of the restored theocracy, its temple, its worship, and the arrangement of the tribes, cannot fail to be of deep significance in its bearing upon this question. Certain facts in regard to Ezekiel are admitted by all: he was himself a priest (i. 3); he had been carried into captivity not before he had reached early manhood; and, whether he had himself ministered in the priest's office at Jerusalem (as Kuenen positively asserts, *Relig. of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 105) or not, he was certainly thoroughly conversant with the ceremonial as there practiced and with the duties of the priesthood; further, he began his prophecies a few years after Zedekiah was carried into captivity, and continued them until near the middle of the Babylonian exile, the last nine chapters being dated "in the 25th year of our captivity," which corresponds with the

3d of Nebuchadrezzar's reign. If any development of Israel's religion, therefore, were going on during the captivity, it must have been already well advanced at the time of this vision. So far there is a general agreement. The main point necessarily follows:—that in such case Ezekiel's vision must present an intermediate stage on the line of progress from that which we certainly know to have existed before to that which we know, with equal certainty, was practiced afterwards.

It is indeed theoretically conceivable that in the course of this development of religion Ezekiel may have been a strange, erratic genius, who was both regardless of the traditions of his fathers and was without influence upon the course of his successors; but such a strange estimation of him is entertained by no one, and needs no refutation. It would be contradicted by his birth, his position as a prophet, his evident estimation among his contemporaries, and his relations to his fellow prophet-priest, Jeremiah. It may be assumed that his writings were an important factor in whatever religious development actually occurred.

This argument is the more important on account of the great weight attached by some critics to the argument *e silentio*. This argument can be only of limited application in regard to historical books, fully occupied as they are with other matters, and only occasionally and incidentally alluding to existing ecclesiastical laws and customs; but it is plainly of great importance in this prophetical setting forth of quite a full and detailed ecclesiastical scheme. The omission of references to any ritual law or feast or ceremony in the historical books can occasion no surprise, and afford no just presumption against the existence of such rites and ceremonies, unless some particular reason can be alleged why they should have been mentioned; but a corresponding omission from the pages of Ezekial is good evidence either that the thing omitted was too familiar to require mention, or else that he purposely excluded it from his scheme. In other words, it shows that what he omits, as compared with the mosaic law, was either already entirely familiar to him and to the people; or else that the law he sets forth was, in these particulars, different from the Mosaic law. To illustrate by an example: There can be no question that circumcision was a fundamental rite of the religion of the Israelites, practiced in all ages of their history; yet, after the Pentateuch and the few first chapters of Joshua, there is no mention of it, and the words *circumcise, circumcised, circumcision,* do not occur in the sacred literature down to the time of Jeremiah; neither does the word *foreskin,* except in connection with David's giving the foreskins of the

Philistines as dowry for Michal (1 Sam. xviii. 25, 27; 2 Sam. iii. 14). Even *uncircumcised*, as a designation of the enemies of Israel, occurs only nine times (Judg. xiv. 3; xv. 18; 1 Sam. xiv. 6; xvii. 26, 36; xxxi. 4; 2 Sam. i. 20; 1 Chron. x. 4; Isa. lii. 1) in the interval, and several of these passages are considered by the critics to be of later date; neither is there any allusion to circumcision in Ezekiel, except the mention of the stranger "uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh" (xliv. 7, 9). Of course, the reason for this, in both cases, is that the law of circumcision was so familiar and the practice so universal that there was no occasion for its mention. On the other hand, the fast of the day of atonement is not mentioned either in the historical books or in Ezekiel. We are not surprised at its omission from the former, nor can this cast any shade of doubt on its observance, unless some passage can be shown in which it would have been likely to be spoken of; but we can only account for its being passed over in the cycle of the festivals in Ezekiel on the supposition that it formed no part of his scheme, while yet, as will be shown farther on, there are indications that he recognizes it, in his other arrangements, as existing in his time.

While abundant references to the Mosaic law may be found in every part of Ezekiel,* it has seemed best to confine the present investigation to the last nine chapters, both because these are by far the most important in this connection, and also because these have been chiefly used in the discussion of the subject. Unfortunately, there is a difference of opinion in regard to the general interpretation of these chapters. Some will have them to be literally understood as the expression of the prophet's hope and expectation of what was actually to be; more generally the vision is looked upon as a figurative description of the future glory of the church, clothed, as all such descriptions must necessarily be, in the familiar images of the past. A determination of this question is not absolutely necessary to the present discussion, but is so closely connected with it, and the argument will be so much clearer when this has first been examined, that it will be well to give briefly some of the reasons for considering Ezekiel's language in this passage to be figurative.†

It is evident that Ezekiel's description differs too widely from the past to allow of the supposition that it is historical; and written at a

---

*For a very ample list of quotations and allusions to the law in Ezekiel, see pp. 105–110 in *A Study of the Pentateuch, for Popular Reading*, &c. By Rufus P. Stebbins, D. D. (Boston, 1881).

†This question is treated more fully in my notes upon these chapters in Bp. Ellicott's *Commentary for English Readers*.

me when the temple lay in ashes and the land desolate, it cannot
fer to the present. It must then have reference to the future. The
resumption is certainly that it portrays an ideal future, because the
hole was seen "in the visions of God" (xl. 2), an expression which
zekiel always applies to a symbolic representation rather than to an
ctual image of things (cf. i. 1; viii. 3; also xi. 24, and xliii. 3).
loreover, if it is to be literally understood, it must portray a state of
ings to be realized either in the near future, or else at a time still in
dvance of our own day. If the former, as is supposed by a few
ommentators, it is plain that the prophecy was never fulfilled, and
emains a monument of magnificent purposes unaccomplished. The
ttempt to explain this by the theory that the returning exiles found
iemselves too few and feeble to carry out the prophet's whole designs,
nd therefore concluded to postpone them altogether to a more con-
enient season, must be regarded as an entire failure. For one of
vo suppositions must be adopted, both of them leading to the same
esult: either that of the negative critics—that certain great features of
ie Mosaic law, such as the distinction between the priests and
evites and the general priestly legislation, had their origin with
zekiel; and in this case it is inconceivable that, while adopting this,
o attention should have been paid to the authority of this great
rophet in other matters; or else we must accept the commonly
eceived view, that the Mosaic law was earlier, and is here profoundly
odified by Ezekiel. In the latter case, however much the returning
xiles might have been disappointed in their circumstances, yet if they
nderstood the prophet literally, they must have looked forward to
ie accomplishment of his designs in the future, and would naturally
ave been anxious to order the restored theocracy on his plan, as far
s they could, from the first, to avoid the necessity of future changes;
nd a large part of the scheme, such as the cycle of the feasts, the
rdering of the sacrifices, &c., was quite within their power. In
ither case, if the vision is to be taken literally, it is inexplicable that
iere should be no reference to it in the historical books of Ezra and
Nehemiah and the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, which all
elate to this period, and describe the return and settlement in the
nd, and the rebuilding of the temple.

It is scarcely necessary to speak of a literal fulfilment still in the
ıture. Ordinarily it is difficult to say that any state of things may
ot possibly be realised in the future; but here there are features of
ie prophecy, and those neither of a secondary nor incidental charac-
er, which enable us to assert positively that their literal fulfilment
ould be a plain contradiction of the Divine revelation. It is impos-

sible to conceive, in view of the whole relations between the old and new dispensations, that animal sacrifices can ever be restored by Divine command and with acceptance to God. And, it may be added, it is equally impossible to suppose that the church of the future, progressing in the liberty wherewith Christ has made it free, should ever return to "the weak and beggarly elements" of Jewish bondage here set forth.

Having thus alluded to these general presumptions, we are prepared to look at those particular indications which have been introduced into the prophecy itself as if to show that it is to be understood ideally. I do not propose to speak of those more general indications, such as the regularity of proportions and forms, the symmetry of measurements &c., which here, as in the later chapters of the apocalypse, give to almost every reader a somewhat indefinable but very strong impression of the ideality of the whole description; but will confine myself to statements which admit of definite tests in regard to their literalness.

In the first place, the connection between the temple and the city of Jerusalem in all the sacred literature of the subject, as well as in the thought of every pious Israelite, is so close that a prophecy incidentally separating them, without any distinct statement of the fact or of the reason for so doing, could hardly have been intended, or have been understood literally. Yet in this passage the temple is described as at a distance of nearly nine and a half miles from the utmost bound of the city, or about fourteen and a quarter miles from its centre.*

A temple in any other locality than Mount Moriah could hardly be the temple of Jewish hope and association. The location of Ezekiel's temple depends upon whether the equal portions of land assigned to

*This holds true, however the tribe portions of the land and the "oblation" are located; for the priests' portion of the "oblation," in the midst of which the sanctuary is placed, (xlviii. 10) is 10,000 reeds, or about nineteen miles broad; to the south of this (xlviii. 15–17) is a strip of land of half the width, in which the city is situated, occupying with its "suburbs" its whole width. These distances, in their exactness, depend upon the length of the cubit which is variously estimated. For the purposes of this discussion it is taken at a convenient average of the conflicting estimates, viz: 20 inches. If it were a little more or a little less the general argument would remain the same. There should also be noticed the view of a few writers (Henderson on xlv. 1; Hengstenberg on xlv. 1, and a few others) that the dimensions given in this chapter are to be understood of *cubits* and not of reeds; but this is so generally rejected, and is in itself so improbable that it seems to require no discussion. Even if adopted, it would only change the amount of the distance and would still leave the temple quite outside the city and separated from it by a considerable space.

ach of the tribes in ch. xlviii. were actually equal in area, or were nly strips of equal width. The latter view is, so far as I know, dopted by all commentators. On this supposition Ezekiel's city ould be several miles north of Jerusalem, and the temple, still north f that, would be well on the road to Samaria. On the other upposition, it would fall nearly in the latitude of Hebron.

In either case, the temple, with its precincts, is described as a mile quare, or larger than the whole ancient city of Jerusalem. In xliii. 2 it is expressly said "that the whole limit thereof round about" is 'upon the top of the mountain." But without pressing this, it is ardly possible that the precincts of any actual temple could be in-ended to embrace such a variety of hill and valley as would be nvolved.

Moreover, the description of the "oblation" itself is physically mpossible. The boundaries of the land are expressly said to be the Mediterranean on the one side and the Jordan on the other (xlvii. 5–21). The eastern boundary is not formed by an indefinite exten-ion into the desert, but is distinctly declared to be the Jordan, and bove that, the boundaries of Hauran and Damascus. It is substan-ially the same with that given in Num. xxxiv. 10–12, and in both ases excludes the trans-Jordanic territory which was not a part of Palestine proper, and in which, even after its conquest, the two and a alf tribes had been allowed to settle with some reluctance (Num. xxii.). Now, if the portions of the tribes were of equal width, the 'oblation" could not have been extended so far south as the mouth f the Jordan; but even at that point the whole breadth of the country, ccording to the English "exploration fund" maps, is only 55 miles. Measuring northwards from this point the width of the oblation, 47⅓ niles, a point is reached where the distance between the river and the ea is only 40 miles. It is impossible therefore that the oblation itself hould be included between them, and the description requires that here should also be room left for the prince's portion at either end. t has been suggested that the prophet might have had in mind meas-rements made on the uneven surface of the soil or along the usual outes of travel; but both these suppositions are absolutely excluded y the symmetry and squareness of this description.

Again: the city of the vision is described as the great city of the estored theocracy; but, as already said, it cannot be placed geo-raphically upon the site of Jerusalem. Either, then, this city must e understood ideally, or else a multitude of other prophecies, and otably many of Ezekiel which speak of Zion and of Jerusalem, nust be so interpreted. There is no good reason why both may not

be figurative, but it is impossible to take both literally; for some of them make statements in regard to the future quite as literal in form as these, and yet in direct conflict with them. Such prophecies, both in Ezekiel and in the other prophets, in regard to Jerusalem, are too familiar to need citation; yet one, on a similar point, from a prophet not much noticed, may be given as an illustration. Obadiah (according to some authorities, a contemporary of Ezekiel) foretells (ver. 19) that at the restoration "Benjamin shall possess Gilead"; but according to Ezekiel, Gilead is not in the land of the restoration at all, and Benjamin's territory is to be immediately south of the "oblation." Again, Obadiah (ver. 20) says, "The captivity of Jerusalem" (which in distinction from "the captivity of the host of the children of Israel," must refer to the two tribes) "shall possess the cities of the south"; but according to Ezekiel, Judah and Benjamin are to adjoin the central "oblation," and four other tribes are to have their portions south of them. Such instances might easily be multiplied. It must surely be a false exegesis which makes the prophets gratuitously contradict each other and even contradict themselves (as in this case of Obadiah) almost in the same sentence.

The division of the land among the twelve tribes; the assignment to the priests and the Levites of large landed estates, and to the former as much as to the latter; the enormous size of the temple precincts and of the city, with the comparatively small allotment of land for its support, are all so singular, and so entirely destitute of either historical precedent or subsequent realization, that only the clearest evidence would justify the assumption that these things were intended to be literally carried out. No regard is paid to the differing numbers of the tribes, but—as if to set forth an ideal equality—an equal strip of land is assigned to each; and, the trans-Jordanic territory being excluded and about one-fifth of the whole land being set apart as an "oblation," the portion remaining allows to each of the tribes only about two-thirds as much territory as, on the average, they had formerly possessed. The geographical order of the tribes is also extremely singular, and bears all the marks of ideality. Moreover, nearly the whole territory assigned to Zebulon and Gad is habitable only by nomads.

A further difficulty with the literal interpretation may be found in the description of the waters which issued from under the eastern threshold of the temple (xlvii. 1–12). This difficulty is so great that some commentators, who have adopted generally a literal interpretation, have found themselves constrained to resort here to the figurative; but on the whole, it has been recognized that the vision is essentially

ne, and that it would be unreasonable to give a literal interpretation o one part of it and a figurative to another. The waters of the vision ın to the "east country," and go down "to the sea," which can only e the Dead Sea; but such a course would be physically impossible ithout changes in the surface of the earth, since the location of the emple of the vision is on the west of the water-shed of the country.* hey had, moreover, the effect of "healing" the waters of the sea, n effect which could not be produced naturally without providing an utlet from the sea, and Ezekiel (xlvii. 11) excludes the idea of an utlet. No supply of fresh water could remove the saltness, while his was all disposed of by evaporation. But, setting aside minor ifficulties, the character of the waters themselves is impossible, ex-ept by a perpetual miracle. Without insisting upon the strangeness f a spring of this magnitude upon the top of "a very high moun-ain" (xl. 2; cf. also xliii. 12), at the distance of 1,000 cubits from heir source, the waters have greatly increased in volume; and so ith each successive 1,000 cubits, until at the end of 4,000 (about a ile and a half) they have become a river no longer fordable, or, in ther words, comparable to the Jordan. Such an increase, without ccessory streams, is clearly not natural. Beyond all this, the descrip-on of the waters themselves clearly marks them as ideal. They are fe-giving and healing; trees of perennial foliage and fruit grow upon heir banks, the leaves being for "medicine," and the fruit, although or food, never wasting. The reader cannot fail to be reminded of the pure river of water of life" in Rev. xxii. 1, 2. "on either side" f which was "the tree of life," with "its twelve manner of fruits" nd its leaves "for the healing of the nations." The author of the pocalypse evidently had this passage in mind; and just as he has eized upon the description of Gog and Magog in chaps. xxxviii., xxix., as an ideal description, and applied it to the events of the ture, so he has treated this as an ideal prophecy, and applied it to he Church triumphant.

Finally, it should be remembered that this whole vision is inti-ately bound together, and all objections which lie against a literal nterpretation of any one part, lie also against the whole. Additional easons for spiritual interpretation will incidentally appear in the fol-owing pages.

If it is now asked—and this seems to be the chosen ground of the

*This is true with any possible location of the "oblation"; for the entral point between the Jordan and the Mediterranean is well on the estern water-shed at every locality from the head waters of the Jordan o the extremity of the Dead Sea.

literal interpreters—why then is this prophecy given with such a wealth of minute material detail? the answer is obvious, that this is thoroughly characteristic of Ezekiel. The tendency to a use of concrete imagery, strongly marked in every part of his book, merely culminates in this closing vision. The two previous chapters, especially, have abounded in definite material details of the attack of a great host upon the land of Israel, while these very details, upon examination, show that they were not meant to be literally understood, and that the whole prophecy was intended to shadow forth the great and final spiritual conflict, prolonged through ages, between the power of the world and the kingdom of God. So here, the prophet, wishing to set forth the glory, the purity, and the beneficent influence of the church of the future, clothes his description in those terms of the past with which his hearers were familiar. The use of such terms was a necessity in making himself intelligible to his contemporaries; just as to the very close of the inspired volume it is still necessary to set forth the glory and joy of the church triumphant under the figures of earthly and familiar things, but no one is misled thereby to imagine that the heavenly Jerusalem will be surrounded by a literal wall of jasper 1,500 miles high (Rev. xxi, 16, 18), or that its 12 gates shall be each of an actual pearl. At the same time the prophet is careful to introduce among his details so many impossible points as to show that his description must be ideal, and its realisation be sought for beneath the types and shadows in which it is clothed. It may be as impossible to find the symbolical meaning of each separate detail as it is to tell the typical meaning of the sockets for the boards of the tabernacle, although the tabernacle as a whole is expressly said to have been a type. This is the case with every vision, and parable, and type, and every form of setting forth truth by imagery; there must necessarily be much which has no independent signification, but is merely subsidiary to the main point. Ezekiel's purpose was so far understood by his contemporaries that they never made any attempt to carry out his descriptions in the rebuilding of the temple and the reconstruction of the State. The idea of a literal interpretation of his words was reserved for generations long distant from his time, from the forms of the church under which he lived, and from the circumstances and habits of expression with which he was familiar, and under the influence of which he wrote.

With this unavoidably prolonged discussion the ground is cleared for a comparison of the *cultus* set forth in this vision of Ezekiel with

hat commanded in the Mosaic law, and an examination of the rela-on between them. This discussion is embarrassed by the difficulty f finding any historical data which will be universally accepted. If e might assume that any of the older historical books of the Old estament were as trustworthy as ordinary ancient histories making o claim to inspiration, or that the books of most of the prophets ere not pious frauds, the task would be greatly simplified. As it is, shall endeavor to conduct the examination on the basis of such bvious facts as would be admitted by the authors of what seem to he writer such strange romances as Kuenen's "Religion of Israel" nd "Prophets and Prophecy in Israel."*

The first point to which attention may be called is the landed prop-rty of the priests and Levites. According to the Mosaic law, they ad no inheritance of land like the other tribes, but merely scattered ities for residence; and were to depend for support, partly upon their ortion of the sacrifices, and chiefly upon the tithes of the people. While the payment of these tithes was commanded, there was abso-itely no provision for enforcing their payment. This rested entirely pon moral obligation, and the condition of the whole Levitical ribe was thus dependent upon the conscientiousness of the Israelites. When the sense of religious obligation was strong, they would be ell provided for; when it was weak, they would be in want. And his is exactly what appears from the general course of the history, as ell as from such special narratives as are universally admitted to be f great antiquity. (See Judg. xvii. 7–18, &c.) Now, after the xile, at a time when there can be no question in regard to the facts, e find the priests and Levites similarly unprovided with landed roperty. The Mosaic law, the condition of things before the exile nd after, agree together; but Ezekiel represents a totally different tate of things. He assigns two strips of territory, one to the priests nd the other to the Levites, each of nearly the same size as the llotment to any of the tribes (xlviii. 9–14). This very small tribe ould thus have had almost twice as much land as any other; and uch a provision would obviously have profoundly modified the whole tate and relations of the priestly order and of the subordinate Levites. n this point, therefore, we find that if any process of development as going on in the ecclesiastical system of Israel, it was such as to

*Substantially the same views, especially in relation to Ezekiel, are aken by Graf (*Die Geschichtl. Bücher des alten Test.*), Smend (*Der Prophet Ezechiel*), and others, with sundry variations in detail; but as Kuenen is the author most widely known, and presents his theories in he most favorable point of view, the references of this paper will be confined to his works.

leave the final result just what it had been before, while the system of Ezekiel, which, on that supposition, should be a middle term between the two, is entirely foreign to both of them.

There are other noteworthy points involved in the same provision. According to Deut. xix. 2–9 three cities, and conditionally another three, and according to Num. xxxv. 9–15 the whole six, were to be selected from the cities of the Levites and appointed as cities of refuge in case of unintentional manslaughter. The same provision is alluded to in Ex. xxi. 13, 14, and it plainly forms an essential feature of the whole Mosaic law in regard to manslaughter and murder. After the conquest, according to Josh. xxi. this command was executed and the cities were distributed as widely as possible in different parts of the land, three of them on either side of the Jordan, the eastern side being considered as an extension of the land not included in the original promise and therefore bringing into force the conditional requirement of Deuteronomy.* But by the arrangement of Ezekiel, the Levites were not to have cities scattered through the land, and their central territory could not afford the necessary ease of access from the distant parts. There is here therefore an essential difference in regard to the whole law in reference to manslaughter and murder, and it is plain that the Mosaic law in this point could not have been devised from Ezekiel.

But besides this obvious inference, it is in the highest degree improbable that this provision of the Mosaic law could have originated after the captivity, when it would have been entirely unsuited to the political condition of the people. Still more, it is inconceivable that the record of the execution of this law by Joshua could have been invented after the time of Ezekiel; for neither in his vision is any such selection of cities indicated, nor in the actual territorial arrangement of the restoration was there any opportunity therefor. Yet the same account which records the selection (incidentally mentioned in connection with each city as it is reached in the list) clearly recognizes the distinction between the priests and the Levites (Josh. xxi.) This distinction then must have been older than Ezekiel.

In quite another point Ezekiel's assignment of territory, taken in connection with Numbers and Joshua, has an important bearing upon the antiquity of the distinction between priests and Levites. According to the Mosaic law the priests were a higher order ecclesiastically

*Deuteronomy was indeed written after the conquest of the trans Jordanic territory; but it was immediately after, and when this territory was yet hardly considered as the home of the tribes. Some writers prefer to consider the number of six cities as fixed and the three conditional, which in their view were never set apart, as making nine.

han the Levites and in accordance with this position, were provided vith a more ample income; for being much less than a tenth of the ribe, the priests received a tenth of the income of all the other Levites Num. xviii. 25–28). Both these facts are in entire accordance with he relations of the priests and Levites in post-exilic times; but they re at variance with those relations as set forth in Joshua, if that be ost-exilic, and also with Ezekiel considered as a preparatory stage of he legislation of the Pentateuch. Of course, the whole body of the evites must have been originally many times more numerous than he members of the single family of Aaron, and if Joshua xxi. be very ncient we need not be surprised that the 48 Levitical cities provided or in Numbers (xxxv. 1–7) should have been given, 13 to the priests nd 35 to the other Levites (Josh. xxi.); for this gave to the priests ndividually a much larger proportion than to the Levites. The same hing is true of the provision made by Ezekiel. The equal strips of and given to the priests collectively and to the Levites collectively, ave much more to the former individually. But all this would have een entirely untrue after the exile. In the census of the returning xiles, given in both Ezra and Nehemiah, the number of priests is set lown as 4289 (Ezra ii. 36–38; Neh. vii. 39–42), while that of the evites—even including the *Nethinim*—is 733, or but little more than ne-sixth of that number (Ez. ii. 40–58; in Neh. vii, 43—60 the umber is 752).* It may indeed be argued that Ezekiel has no re- ard to the actual numbers of the two bodies, but writing at an early tage of the process of separation between the priests and the Levites, ntends to put them upon a precise equality; and that only at a later eriod was the pecuniary provision for the Levites made inferior to hat of the priests. If this be so, then Joshua xxi. must be post- xilic; for in its whole arrangement it clearly recognizes the distinc- ion and the superiority of the priests. Yet this gives 35 cities to the ery few Levites and only 13 to the comparatively numerous priests—

*Kuenen (*Relig. of Isr.* Vol. II. p. 203, 204) and his school undertake o explain this disparity of numbers by the supposition that the Levites vere "degraded priests" of which he thinks he finds evidence in Ezek. liv. 10–16. For the present point this is quite immaterial; all that is ere required is admitted by him—the fact of the great disparity in num- ers. But the supposition itself is quite gratuitous, and rests upon two nfounded assumptions: (1) that "the Levites" in ver. 10 cannot be sed κατ' ἐξοχήν for the priests—a point to be spoken of elsewhere; and 2) that the "sons of Zadok" ver. 15, is synonymous with "sons of Aaron," which is not true. The simple and natural explanation of the assage in Ezekiel is that the prophet means to degrade the *priests* who ave been guilty of idolatry. (See Curtiss' *The Levitical Priests* p. 4–77.)

in other words is self-contradictory. In this respect the bearing of Ezekiel is plain; it makes the Mosaic law and the history of Joshua consistent if they were ancient, but inconsistent and self-contradictory if Ezekiel's vision was a stage in the late differentiation of the priests from the Levites.

We are now prepared to go a step further. It is agreed on all sides that Ezekiel recognizes a distinction between the priests and the Levites. To an ordinary reader of his book it appears that he makes this recognition incidentally and as a matter of course, as of an old, familiar, and established distinction. He nowhere states that there shall be such a distinction, nor gives any grounds upon which it shall rest, nor describes who shall be included in the one body and who in the other, except that he confines the priests to "the sons of Zadok" (xl. 46; xliii. 19; xliv. 15; xlviii. 11), of which more will be said presently. Certainly this does not look, upon the face of it, like the original institution of this distinction. But Kuenen (*Relig. of Isr.* vol. 2 p. 116) asserts that at the time of Josiah's reformation, "all the Levites, without exception, were considered qualified to serve as priests of Jahweh," and that "Ezekiel is the first to desire other rules *for the future*;" and that the priestly laws of the Pentateuch, of which he had no knowledge, were subsequent. Again he says (ib. p. 153) "Ezekiel, in uttering his wishes as to the future, made a beginning of committal to writing of the priestly tradition. The priests in Babylonia went on in his footsteps. A first essay in priestly legislation—remains of which have been preserved to us in Lev. xviii–xxvi. —was followed by others, until at last a complete system arose, contained in an historical frame. Possessed of this system, the priestly exiles, and among them Ezra in particular, could consider themselves entitled and called upon to come forward as teachers in Judea, and to put in practice the ordinances which hitherto had been exclusively of theoretical interest to them." * These passages are cited from Kuenen simply to bring distinctly before the mind the theory which has recently gained acceptance with an intelligent school of critics; it is the bearing upon this of the vision of Ezekiel which we are to consider. The question to be asked is whether the more careful examination of this vision bears out the *prima facie* impression produced by it, or confirms the somewhat elaborate theory of Kuenen.

There can be no manner of doubt that in Ezekiel's time there already existed two classes of persons known respectively as "priests"

* He admits that the distinction is recognized in 1 Kings viii. 4, but says "this is merely in consequence of a clerical error." *Relig. Isr.* vol. II. p. 301.)

nd as "Levites." Whatever may have been the ground of the dis-nction, and whether or not all were equally entitled to offer sacri-ces, Ezekiel certainly recognizes the two classes as existing, since he ould not otherwise have used the terms without defining them. The evites, of course, may be considered already well known as the escendants of the tribe of Levi; but why not the priests in a similar ay? How could he have used the term in distinction from the evites, if no such distinction had been hitherto known?

But further: Ezekiel assigns to the priests the functions of offering ne sacrifices and of eating the sin offering, while to the Levites he ives the duty of "ministering in the sanctuary." Of course the ere expression "minister" (xliv. 11) might, if it stood alone, be nderstood of any sort of service; but the whole context shows it is eant of a service inferior to the priests, and the existence here of the me distinctions as those of the Mosaic law has been so universally cognized as to lead some scholars to argue that the provisions of this w must have been derived from this prophet. It is found however, at precisely the same distinction appears, and precisely the same uties are assigned respectively to the priests and to the Levites in the ges before Ezekiel. There is no occasion to speak of the functions f the priests since there is no dispute about them; in regard to the evites, I will refer only to a single passage already cited by Kuenen *ubi sup.* p. 304) as pre-exilic, and of especial interest because it is ken from Deuteronomy (xviii. 1–8), and is partly in the same words s those used by Ezekiel. At first sight it appears to join the two asses together, but on closer examination is found to make a clear istinction between them. "The priests the Levites, all the tribe of evi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel; they shall eat ne offerings of the Lord made by fire, and his inheritance" (vs. 1). his statement has been thought to show that the whole tribe was ere treated as a unit, with no distinction between its members. If it ood alone it might be so regarded; but the lawgiver immediately oes on to speak separately of the two parts of the tribe: "And this all be the priests' due from the people, from them that offer a sac-fice," specifying the parts of the victim and also the first fruits; "for ne Lord thy God hath chosen him out of all thy tribes to stand to inister in the name of the Lord, him and his sons forever." So far out the priests. Then follows, "And if a Levite come from any of y gates out of all Israel, where he sojourned, and come with all ne desire of his mind unto the place which the Lord shall choose, nen he shall minister in the name of the Lord his God, as all his rethren the Levites do, which stand before the Lord. They shall

have like portions to eat, besides that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony." There is here nothing, as in the case of the priests, about sacrifice; but the Levites appear to be inferior ministrants, just as in the Book of Numbers; and it is provided that any of the tribe, wherever he has before lived, may come and join himself to their number and share in the provision for their support, without regard to his private property. The supposition that the Levites referred to in these last verses were also priests, *i. e.* entitled to offer sacrifice, would be exegetically inadmissible; for they are said to "come from any of thy gates out of all Israel," while in Josh. xxi. 9–19 the cities of the priests (described also as the sons of Aaron) are confined to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Simeon. Consequently those who were to offer sacrifice could not "come from any of thy gates out of all Israel."* But independently of this fact, the priests are mentioned in Deuteronomy with their duties, then afterwards the Levites separately with their duties, which are not the same; and the point would require to be otherwise most clearly proved before it could be admitted that the persons were the same. Of course Ezekiel's vision, while it separates clearly the priests from the Levites, yet in assigning to each of them a compact territory, looks to an entirely different state of things from that contemplated in Numbers or fulfilled in Joshua.

Again: the expression "the priests the Levites" used seven times in Deuteronomy (xvii. 9, 18; xviii. 1; xxi. 5; xxiv. 8; xxvii. 9; xxxi. 9) and twice in Joshua (iii. 3; viii. 33) has been relied upon as a proof that the two classes were not distinguished when these books were written. That this argument will not apply to Joshua has already appeared, and Curtiss in his "Levitical Priests"† has shown that the same expression is used in the post-exilic books of Chronicles; but our concern is with Ezekiel. He has the expression twice (xlii. 19; xliv. 15) and each time with an addition which leaves no possible doubt of his meaning: "that be of the seed of Zadok" and "sons of Zadok." Hence the same reasoning which would make all Levites into priests in Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Chronicles, would make them all into "sons of Zadok" in Ezekiel.

But this leads to another fact in the prophet's description of the priesthood. As already said, he recognizes as the priests of the future

*This difficulty might be avoided by supposing Joshua to be later than Deuteronomy; but it has already been shown that this would only involve other and no less formidable difficulties on the other side.

†"The Levitical Priests, a contribution to the criticism of the Pentateuch." By S. J. Curtiss, jr., Ph. D. with a preface by Franz Delitzsch, Edinburgh and Leipzig, 1877.

nly "the sons of Zadok (xl. 46; xliii. 19; xliv. 15; xlviii. 11). Kuenen indeed seems to assume (*ubi sup.* p. 116) that "sons of adok" and "sons of Aaron" are synonymous terms; it needs no rgument to show that they are really very different. By universal greement, the priesthood was not of old restricted to the "sons of adok," and it may be added, I suppose by the same universal greement, it was not so restricted afterwards. The return of other riests is mentioned by Ezra (ii. 36–39) and Nehemiah (vii. 39–42), nd I do not know that there has ever been any question that priests f other families served in the temple in later ages. Here then the rophet is found, as in so many other cases, to be at variance alike ith the earlier and the later practice and with the Mosaic law, instead f constituting a link between them. If it be alleged that he pro-osed to restrict the priesthood to the family of Zadok, but that this as found impracticable and his successors carried out his plan as r as they could, by restricting it to the wider family of Aaron, it may ell be asked, where is the proof of this? Where is the thought or ıggestion anywhere outside of Ezekiel that such a narrower restric-on was ever desired or attempted? If we look upon the prophet's escription as ideal, the whole matter is plain enough. "The sons f Zadok," in view of the facts of history, are the faithful priests, and nly such would Ezekiel have to minister; but as a scheme for a hange in the actual and literal priesthood, the whole matter is inex-licable.

Another point in which Ezekiel differs from the Mosaic ritual is in egard to the persons who were to slay the ordinary sacrificial victims. ccording to Lev. i. 5, 11; iii. 2, 8, 13; iv. 4 (cf. 15), 24, 29, 33, ıe victim was to be killed by the one who made the offering, and ccording to Ex. xii. 6, the same rule was to be observed with regard o the Passover. This was apparently the custom in all ages. The ınguage of Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 9. § 1), although not very clear, vors this supposition, and the record in 2 Chron. xxix. 20, ss., 34; xx. 17 seems decisive. In this post-exilic book, in the account of ıe purification of the sanctuary under Hezekiah, the exceptional acrifices of the purification are said to be slain by the priests, and the ssistance of the Levites in flaying the victims is expressly excused on ccount of the insufficiency in the number of the priests, while at the ıbsequent Passover it is said "the Levites had the charge of the illing the Passovers for everyone that was not clean." These excuses or these acts imply that, in the time of the Chronicler, it was still the ustom for the people to kill their own sacrifices and for the priests to ay them. The Levitical law and the post-exilic custom (as well as

the pre-exilic) here agree as usual; but Ezekiel is quite apart from them and provides (xliv. 11) that the Levites "shall slay the burnt offering and the sacrifice for the people." Here again he is not at all in the line of a developing system. It may be added incidentally that the Samaritan Pentateuch shows what would have been the actual progress of development if it had existed in these matters in Israel; for, by changing the number of the pronouns and verbs in Leviticus, it makes the priests the slayers of the victims in all cases.

It has often been noticed that the office of high-priest is ignored in this vision, and an argument has been based on this fact to show that the writings of Ezekiel mark an early stage in the development of the Jewish hierarchy, when the precedence of the high-priest had not yet been established. The fundamental statement itself is not strictly true, and it will appear presently that the prophet, in several different ways, incidentally recognizes the existence of the high-priest and of some of the principal laws in relation to him. But the high-priest fills a prominent and important place in the Mosaic legislation, and if it could be shown on the one hand that there was no high-priest before the captivity, and on the other, that Ezekiel knew of none, it would certainly create a presumption that the laws of the priesthood might be of later origin. But the facts are so precisely opposite, that the maintenance of such propositions seems very strange. It may be well to refer again to Kuenen, as a fair exponent of this school of critics, to show that the non-existence of the high-priesthood before the captivity is distinctly maintained by them. He admits, indeed, "that one of the high-priests, who bore the title of *Kohên hagadôl* ['the high-priest'] or *Kohên rôsch* ['the head-priest'], at any rate from the days of Jehoash, stood at the head of the Jerusalem priests," but he associates him in honor and rank only with the three "door-keepers," and tells us that the various passages cited "teach us that one of the priests superintended the temple, or, in other words, kept order there, in which duty he was of course assisted by others"; and that "it follows, from 2 Kings xi. 18; xii. 12; Jer. xxix. 26, that this post was instituted by Jehoiada, the contemporary of King Jehoash" (*Relig. of Isr.* vol. II. p. 304). Again he marks emphatically, as one of the evidences of the late origin of the high-priesthood, that "the distinction between the duties of the priests and the high-priest, Lev. xxi. 1–9 and verses 10–15, does not occur at all in Ezekiel" (*ib.* p. 190). And still again (*ib.* p. 214), he represents that, even in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, the duties and authority of the high-priest were still in a vague and unsettled condition.

The point here to be determined is whether we have evidence of

the existence before the captivity of a high-priesthood as an important, regular office, transmitted by inheritance, and forming one of the fundamental features of the Israelitish polity. Of course, we could not expect to find in such histories as have been preserved other than meagre and incidental allusions to the details of the high-priest's duties, his dress, and such matters. Such allusions do occur, as in the case of Ahimelech at the time of David's flight (1 Sam. xxi. 1–9). and of the ephod of Abiathar (1 Sam. xxiii. 6, 9—observe that in ver. 9 it is הָאֵפֹד with the definite article), in connection with David's enquiry of the Lord. (Comp. also the charge against Ahimelech that he "enquired of the Lord" for David. 1 Sam. xxii. 10, 15). But the question is not about these matters of detail; the main point is, that in Israel the priestly order had, and almost of necessity must have had, especially in the times before the monarchy, an authoritative and real head, as was the case with other nations of antiquity. Even the exception here proves the rule, and we find that temporarily, in one anomalous period of the history, during the reign of David, there were two heads or high-priests, Zadok and Abiathar. The latter, after the slaughter of his father and kinsman by Saul, had fled to David in his outlawry and had become, as he was entitled to become by inheritance, his high-priest. Meantime the office could not be left in abeyance under the regular government, and when David ascended the throne he found the high-priesthood occupied by Zadok. He did not presume to displace him, and neither would he displace the faithful sharer of his own adversity; so it came about that both were recognized. This anomalous state of things was the more tolerable because at the same time, according to the history, the ark and the tabernacle were separated, while the duties of the high priest were connected with both of them. The high priest, or during the period just mentioned, the two high priests, are mentioned in the following passages which are expressly cited by Kuenen (*Relig.* of *Isr.* Note II. on ch. viii. Vol. II., p. 304) as pre-exilic: 2 Sam. viii. 17; xx. 25; 1 Ki. iv. 4; ii. 22, 26, 27; 2 Ki. xii. 10; xxii. 4, 8; xxiii. 4; xxv. 18; Jer. xx. 1. It is well known how greatly this list might be extended, and also how often the high priest is mentioned in the books of Joshua and 1 Samuel, the names of Eleazar, Phinehas, Eli or Ahiah, being often given in connection with the office, besides those of Ahimelech, Abiathar, Zadok, and Ahitub. It would be hard to find any single fact in the whole compass of Israelitish history in itself more probable or more abundantly attested than the existence of the office of a real high priest, an important functionary

in the kingdom, the counsellor of the rulers, and whose especial office it was to "enquire of the Lord" and communicate His commands at important national emergencies. There is also perfectly clear and ample evidence of the continued existence of the same office after the captivity. Jeremiah (lii. 24–27) and the author of the second book of Kings (xxv. 18–21) give the name of the person who held the office at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, Seraiah, who was put to death by Nebuchadnezzar; while Ezra (ii. 2; iii. 2, 8, 9; iv. 3; v. 2; x. 18) and Nehemiah (vii. 7; xii. 1, 7, 10, 26) unite with Haggai (i. 1, 12, 14; ii., 2, 4) and Zechariah (iii. 1, 3, 6, 8, 9; vi. 11) in mentioning Joshua, or Jeshua, the son of Josedeck, as the high priest of the restoration. But Ezekiel's vision, it is said, recognizes no such office, and as will be seen presently, intentionally excludes it. Once more then, this vision not only gives no countenance, but is in direct opposition to the theory, that Ezekiel originated or was a direct link in the development of the priesthood from an earlier to a later differing form.

There is however, one curious point incidentally occurring in the vision which shows that Ezekiel was familiar with the office of high priest. In the various measurements of the temple and all its details given in chaps. xli., xlii., the prophet everywhere accompanies the measuring angel until he comes to the holy of holies. There the angel enters alone, as is shown by a sudden change in the language (xli. 3). This certainly has the appearance of a consciousness on the part of Ezekiel, the priest, that he might not enter there, and (since it cannot be supposed that this part of the temple was not to be entered at all) an allusion to that provision of the law by which entrance into the holy of holies was forbidden to all, save to the high priest only on the great day of atonement. I do not know of any other explanation, and if this be the true one, it shows that not only the high priest, but the principal Mosaic law in regard to him and also the day of atonement was known to the prophet.

That the omission of the high priest from this vision is not accidental but intentional is shown by the laws of the priesthood here set forth. These laws treat the priesthood as a single body without distinction and, considered only in themselves, admit of either of two interpretations: (1) on the development hypothesis, that they are original and general laws which were subsequently differentiated into the special stricter ones for the high priest, and the less strict for his brethren; or (2) that the specific laws were actually older than Ezekiel, but when he omitted the high priest from his scheme, he combined them into a certain mean between the two. The choice

between these two hypotheses is at once determined in favor of the latter if, as has already been shown, there was a real high priest in the previous ages. All reasonable ground of argument from these laws in favor of the development hypothesis is thus taken away; and not only so, but it is evident from the vision that Ezekiel knew of those stricter laws in regard to the high priest which did not apply to the priesthood in general. Besides the allusion already mentioned, the peculiarity of the prophet's laws appears especially in two points: in regard to marriage, and in regard to mourning. For the former, the Levitical law allowed the marriage of the ordinary priest to any but a profane or divorced woman, laying no restriction upon the marriage with a widow (Lev. xxi. 7); but it restricted the high priest to marriage with "a virgin of his own people" (*ib.* 14). Ezekiel makes a general compromise law for all, allowing marriage with a widow in case her former husband had been a priest (xliv. 22). The same thing is true of mourning. Ezekiel in general repeats literally the law of Lev. xxi. 1–3, 11–14, but while there is there a distinction between the high-priest and the ordinary priest, here there is one intermediate regulation. In Leviticus the ordinary priest might be "defiled for the dead" "for his kin that is near unto him," while this is in all cases whatever forbidden to the high-priest; in Ezekiel (xliv. 25–27) such defilement for the dead that "is near of kin" is allowed to all, but must be followed not only by the ordinary cleansing after contact with a dead body (see Num. xix, 11–17), but also by a second special period of seven days closed by a sin offering before the priest again enters upon the discharge of his duties. It will be noticed that there is here not only allusion to the laws of Leviticus, but also to a cleansing, apparently that prescribed in Numbers.

The regulations for the priests' dress (xliv. 17–19) require no especial notice. They are very brief; and as far as they go, are a simple reproduction of the provisions of Lev. xxviii. They have altogether the air of presupposing a knowledge of that law and specifying only a few particulars to recall the whole. As far as any inference is to be drawn from them, it is decidedly in favor of a recognition of the detailed precepts of Leviticus as already familiar.

We may now pass to the feasts and sacrifices and under this general head two points are to be considered: 1st, the changes in the ritual of the particular feasts and sacrifices, and 2d, the changes in the cycle of the feasts themselves. Under the former head the change which, if literally carried out, would have been the most striking one to the Israelite because most constantly before his mind, was that in the daily burnt offering. Ezekiel requires that there shall be a burnt

offering every morning; he says nothing whatever of an evening sacrifice and his language is justly thought to exclude the idea of one (xlvi. 13–15). The Mosaic law commanded that there should be a burnt offering *both* morning and evening (Ex. xxix. 38, 39; Num. xxviii. 3, 4; cf. also Lev. vi. 8, 9). Is this an enlargement of, and therefore later than Ezekiel's prescription? Of course this will depend upon whether there is evidence of the custom of evening sacrifice before the time of the exile. There are two passages which, as they stand in our version, are clear and decisive upon this point. In 1 Ki. xviii. 36 it is said in connection with the controversy between Elijah and the prophets of Baal on Mt. Carmel, "It came to pass at the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that Elijah" &c. Here this is evidently regarded as so fixed a custom as to suffice in itself to make the hour. Again, in 2 Ki. xvi. 15, when Ahaz had introduced his own idolatrous altar and yet wished the legal sacrifices to go on as usual, he "commanded Urijah the priest, saying, upon the great altar burn the morning burnt offering, and the evening meat offering" &c. Either of these passages, much more both of them, would be entirely decisive were it not for the fact that the word used for the evening sacrifice in both cases is מִנְחָה and it is urged that this means an unbloody sacrifice. After the restoration also, when Ezra on one occasion "sat astonied until the evening sacrifice" (Ezra ix. 4) the word is the same. It is therefore suggested by some interpreters that before and after the exile, as far as the time of Ezra, the custom may have been to offer a burnt offering in the morning and an unbloody oblation in the evening; and this interpretation is thought to be confirmed by Ps. cxli. 2, "Let my prayer be set before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening מִנְחָה." From this it is argued that the Mosaic law, being at variance with this custom, and also with Ezekiel, must be of later origin; but if so, it must be also later than the book of Daniel, (which these critics place at 165 B. C.) for he also describes the hour of evening sacrifice as "the time of the evening מִנְחָה" (ix. 21). As far as Ezekiel is concerned, this argument is seen, on a moment's reflection, to have no force; for it is just as difficult to account for his omission of a regular evening oblation as of a burnt offering. But the matter cannot be left here, for the whole interpretation is wrong. The technical meaning of מִנְחָה as an unbloody oblation belongs to the Levitical law, and if this law be of later origin, as is claimed by some critics, this sense cannot be carried back to an earlier time. Besides, this

oblation was never offered alone except in certain peculiar cases which do not bear upon the question;* it was always an accompaniment of the bloody sacrifice. If, therefore, it could be proved—which it cannot—that in 1 and 2 Kings and Ezra the unbloody oblation was meant, it would yet remain that the mention of it implies and involves also the animal sacrifice. But the sense of the word outside of the technical language of the law is very general, being applied to an ordinary present (Gen. xxxii. 13 [14], 18 [19], 20 [21], 21 [22]; xxxiii. 10; xliii. 11, and frequently), or to tribute (Judg. iii. 15–18, and frequently); and when this is a present to God, or sacrifice, it is applied indifferently to the unbloody or to the animal sacrifice. Thus it is used of the animal sacrifice of Abel as well as of the unbloody offering of Cain (Gen. iv. 3–5); in 1 Sam. ii. 29 it is clearly meant to include all sacrifices, but with especial reference to those of animals; in 1 Sam. iii. 14 it is used with זֶבַח of a propitiatory sacrifice; in Mal. i. 13 it clearly refers to an animal sacrifice, since the "torn, and the lame, and the sick" are mentioned. In fact, it is a general word for sacrifice of any kind, and while, following the technical language of the law, it is often used specifically, and applied to the unbloody, as distinguished from the animal sacrifice, yet it is also used of sacrifice in general in such a way that it must be supposed to include the animal sacrifice (see 1 Sam. ii. 17; xxvi. 19; 1 Chr. xvi. 29; Ps. xcvi. 8; Zeph. iii. 10; Mal. i. 10; ii. 12, 13; iii. 3, 4). There is therefore no ground for the theory that the evening מִנְחָה of 1 Kings xviii. 29; 2 Kings xvi. 15; and Ezra ix. 4, refers to an unbloody offering. In fact, the argument would prove too much; for the same expression is used also of the morning sacrifice in 2 Kings iii. 20, "it came to pass in the morning, when the מִנְחָה was offered." It remains, therefore, that here, as elsewhere, Ezekiel's provisions stand quite apart from the law and the custom, and give no indication of being a step in the development of a *cultus*.

---

*The only certain exception is the offering of jealousy (Num. v. 15–26). In addition, the unbloody oblation was allowed (Lev. ii. 1–9; vii. 9, 10) as a voluntary offering, although this was probably in connection with the other sacrifices. Also it was a special offering of Aaron and his sons "in the day of their consecration" (Lev. vi. 20–23 [13–16]) in connection with their other offerings. Further, an offering of the first fruits of vegetable products was allowed (Lev. ii. 12–16; vi. 14–18 [7, 8]), but in so far as this was "the first fruits of the harvest" it was to be accompanied with a lamb for a burnt offering (Lev. xxiii. 10–12, 17, 18). The sin offering of fine flour of the very poor (Lev. v. 20–13) is expressly distinguished from the מִנְחָה.

We regard these divergences, on the contrary, as intentional and designed to show the people, familiar with the Mosaic law, that his vision was to be understood ideally and not literally.

There is another point in connection with this daily offering. According to the law (Num. xxviii. 3–5) with each of the lambs morning and evening, a meat and drink offering was to be made of 1-10 of an ephah of flour, ¼ of a hin of oil, and ¼ of a hin of strong wine. As Ezekiel speaks of but one offering he increases the accompanying meat offering to 1-6 of an ephah of flour, and to ⅓ of a hin of oil. This is the same sort of change as in the case of the priests' marriage and mourning: the omitted provision is compensated for by an increase in what remains. And in this case also, the omitted provision having been certainly customary before the time of Ezekiel this compensation has a manifest reference to the familiar, and therefore previously existing provisions of the Mosaic law.

An objection may be here interposed that the non-observance of the detail of Ezekiel's ritual in the subsequent ages is no more surprising than the corresponding non-observance of many particulars in the detail of the Mosaic ritual, which is very evident in the time of the Judges and the early monarchy. There is really no parallel between the two cases. The times of the Judges and of the early monarchy were a period of disorder and anarchy, in which the general confusion of society forbids the inference that such laws did not exist; but the times after Ezekiel were times of over-scrupulous and even superstitious observance of the minutest details of ritual, when it is inconceivable that his scheme should have been neglected through mere inadvertence and carelessness.

The ritual of the great feasts is considerably changed. Pentecost and the Day of Atonement are entirely omitted. In regard to the comparative value of these omissions in the historical books and in Ezekiel, the same thing is to be said as before: the omission in the former may have been merely accidental, and proves nothing; in Ezekiel it must have been intentional. It will appear presently however, that while omitting the Day of Atonement from his scheme he does probably allude to it in a way that shows familiarity with its observance. There remain to be considered the Passover, the feast of Tabernacles, and the "New Moons."

The Passover, according to Ezek. xlv. 21–23, is to be kept at the same time and for the same number of days, as in the Mosaic law but there is no mention of the Paschal lamb itself; the sin-offering by the Mosaic law (Num. xxviii. 17, 22) was to be a he-goat for each day, here (vs. 23) a bullock for the first day and a he-goat for each of

the other days; the burnt offering for each day by the law was to be two bullocks, a ram and seven yearling lambs, here seven bullocks and seven rams; the meat offering by the law was to be 3-10 of a ephah of meal mixed with oil for each bullock, 2-10 for each ram, and 1-10 for each lamb, or in all 1½ ephahs daily—here a whole ephah for each victim, or in all 14 ephahs daily and as many hins of oil (vs. 24). The offerings in Ezekiel therefore are richer than those required by the law. The same thing is to be said of the special sacrifices for the Sabbaths. According to the law (Num. xxviii. 9) these were to be marked by two lambs for burnt offerings, each with the usual meat and drink offering; but according to this vision (xlvi. 4–5) the Sabbath burnt offering was to be six lambs and a ram, with an ephah for a meat offering with the ram, and that for the lambs dependent upon the ability and generosity of the prince, and in all cases a hin of oil to each ephah. (Nothing is said of the drink offering.) It is difficult to assign reasons for these details. They plainly do not agree with the Mosaic law, and it is well known that the custom of later ages was founded upon that law. We have no data in history before the exile to determine the custom in these details one way or the other; but the presumption is that here as elsewhere the prophet has intentionally varied from the known law and custom in order to mark the ideal character of his vision. Certainly this is no beginning or early stage in a developing *cultus;* for otherwise, in these details, which could as well be arranged one way as another, the authority of the prophet would have been followed; but there never was any attempt even, so far as historw shows, to realize his ideal.

The feast of Tabernacles, which has no name given to it in Ezekiel, but is simply a feast of seven days in the seventh month (xlv. 25), is greatly simplified. Here the sacrifices are to be the same as in the case of the Passover,—an entire change from the elaborate ritual of the Mosaic law (Num. xxix. 12–24)—with, on the whole, a great diminution in the number of victims and an omission of the extra eighth day added to the feast in Lev. (xxiii. 36, 39) and Num. (xxix. 35), and which in the law was expressly characterized as an addition,—sometimes included and sometimes not in the mention of the feast. In regard to these changes the same remarks are to be made as in the case of the Passover, with only this addition, that it appears from both 1 Kings viii. 65, 66 and 2 Chron. vii. 8–10 that this eighth day was always looked upon in the same way—as a part, and yet not a part, of the feast. Solomon keeps the feast to that day inclusive,

and then he makes a solemn assembly, and yet on that day dismisse the people to their homes.*

In regard to the New Moons, or the first day of every month, th Mosaic law prescribes (in addition to the burnt and meat offerings a he-goat for a sin offering (Num. xxviii. 15). In Ezekiel's schem of the feasts, these new moons are entirely omitted, except for th first month, though afterwards incidentally alluded to. The Mosai law also provided on the tenth of the seventh month for a day atonement, with special and very peculiar sacrifices (Lev. xvi.). A this is condensed, as it were, in this vision, into two sacrifices, eac of a young bullock, one upon the first and one upon the seventh da of the first month, with particulars in regard to them (to be men tioned presently) which seem to refer to the day of Atonement. Now it is certain from the history of David (1 Sam. xx. 5, 18, 24) an from other historical records (2 Kings iv. 23; 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; Chron. ii. 4; viii. 13; xxxi. 3), as well as from allusions in the pre exilic prophets (Isa. i. 13, 14; [lxvi. 23; Ps. lxxxi. 3]; Hos. ii. 1 Amos viii. 5) that the new moons were kept as sacred feasts in th ages before the exile, as it is known that they were also afterward (Ezra iii. 5; Neh. x. 33). The omission of these new moons fro this description of the feasts is particularly instructive, because Ezeki himself, in other parts of the vision (xliv. 17; xlvi. 3), incidentall but repeatedly, mentions the "new moons" (in the plural) a days to be sanctified by special sacrifices, and requires the prince t provide the same offerings for them as for the Sabbath (xlvi. 6). He thus shows that he was familiar with them and expects them t be continued, but in this setting forth of the cycle of the feasts h does not mention them. This cannot be taken then for a part of th development of a priestly law.

He differs from the Mosaic law also in the ritual of the blood these sacifices on the first and seventh days of the first month. Th Levitical law gives no directions for the blood of the offerings o the first day of the month, doubtless because it followed the ordinar rule and was simply sprinkled on the side of the altar; but it require

* The inconsistency which Kuenen (*Relig. of Isr.* Note II. on cha viii. vol. ii. p. 296, 7) thinks he finds between the passages above cited wholly imaginary. Solomon observed seven days for the dedication the altar in imitation of Lev. viii.–x., and then kept the feast for seve days after the altar had been consecrated. Hence 1 Kings viii. 65 speak of "seven days and seven days, even for fourteen days," and then of th following "eighth day"; while 2 Chron. viii. 9 explains more fully "the kept the dedication of the altar seven days and the feast seven days."

† The word is, in this last case, in the singular, as is also the Sabbath but both are evidently used collectively.

ne blood on the day of Atonement to be brought within the Holy of Holies and sprinkled before and upon the mercy seat. Ezekiel again compromises and directs that the blood of the sin offering on the first and seventh days of the first month shall be put "upon the posts of the house, and upon the four corners of the settle f the altar, and upon the posts of the gate of the inner court." There may be here a reminiscence of the day of Atonement, ut nothing like a generic law which could have been specialized into ne particular observances of the Mosaic law. It is rather a purely leal ritual, which nobody ever thought of reducing to practice. There is no such congruity between it and the Levitical regulations s a development hypothesis would require.

We may now consider, in a few words, the general cycle of the easts. As is well known, the Mosaic law prescribes three great feasts, nat of the Passover for seven days, preceded by the putting away of eaven and the killing of the Paschal lamb; that of "weeks" or Pentecost, lasting only one day; and that of Tabernacles, lasting even days, and with an eighth special day added; these three great nnual festivals are all expressly recognized in Deuteronomy (xvi. –16), which is held by all to be pre-exilic. Besides these, the first ay of every month, the weekly Sabbath, and the day of atonement ere to be kept holy and marked by special sacrifices. The observnce of nearly all of these is recognized in the historic and the older rophetical books. The cycle of Ezekiel's vision is very different. He omits the feast of weeks, the Day of Atonement, and the new noons (except that of the first month,) and inserts a new feast on the eventh day of the same month. This last, in connection with that n the first day of that month, he seems to intend as a compensation or the missing Day of Atonement; for he describes the sacrifices of ne two (xlv. 20) as "for every one that erreth, and for him that is mple: so shall ye reconcile the house." If this interpretation is orrect, we have here an incidental recognition of the older observnce of the Day of Atonement, although it is not mentioned. But owever this may be, Ezekiel's cycle of feasts accords neither with hat went before nor with what followed after him. Yet, as already aid, it is plain from his incidental allusions to the New Moons that, n this point at least, he knew of the old order, and expected it to go n; and it is noticeable that the sacrifices prescribed for the New Moons (xlvi. 3–6) are not the same as the special sacrifices of the first nonth (xliv. 18–20). Those were to be in each case "a young bulock" for a sin offering; these, six lambs and a ram for a burnt offerng (xlvi. 4). It is clear, therefore, that he did not intend this vision

to form the basis of an actual *cultus;* but knowing the old observances, expected them to continue.

Before leaving this part of the subject, it may be well to refer briefly to a few other places in which Ezekiel evidently recognizes the Mosaic law, although either altering or omitting its provisions. In xlii, 13 he requires the priests to eat in the appropriate "holy chambers" "the meat offering, and the sin offering, and the trespass offering." He says nothing of the peace offerings, though he elsewhere repeatedly mentions them (xliii. 27; xlv. 15, 17; xlvi. 2, 12), nor does he anywhere give the ritual for them. On the other hand, in the following verse (and also in xlvi. 18, 20) the prophet is more explicit than the law, requiring that "the priests'" garments wherein they minister "shall not be carried" out of the holy place into the outer court. There is no such general direction in the Levitical law; but the same thing is required in certain special cases, and may therefore be thought to be implied in all (see Lev. vi. 10, 11). Now, whatever theory is adopted concerning the relation of Ezekiel to the Mosiac law must equally explain this omission and this insertion. The theory of the later development of the law does neither; for, in the one case, it would be a violent supposition that the ritual of the peace offerings and the directions about eating them were evolved from the prophet's silence, and in the other case, it would be very strange that in such a matter as the care of the priests' robes the later law should be the less definite. But the hypothesis of the greater antiquity of the law explains both facts satisfactorily; Ezekiel had no occasion to repeat important provisions of the law with which both he and the people were familiar, but it was natural that in a matter of detail, he should express what was probably the common understanding of the law.

In xliii. 11 it is required that the priests' sin offering should be burned "in the appointed place of the house, without the Sanctuary." This refers to a building "in the separate place" which is provided only in Ezekiel's vision (xli. 12–15; xlii. 1, 10, 13), and of which there is no trace either in the Pentateuch or in the temple of the restoration. In such cases it was simply required in the law that the body of the victim should be burned "without the camp" (Lev. iv. 12, 13, 21; xvi. 27, &c.). No doubt such a building as Ezekiel provided would have been a great convenience; but it was never erected.

The provision for large landed estates for the priests has already been mentioned; but in view of this the statement in xliv. 28, that the priests' office and perquisites "shall be unto them for an inherit-

nce: I am their inheritance: and ye shall give them no inheritance n Israel," can only be looked upon as a reminiscence of the expres- ions in the Mosaic law, without any nice regard to the other parts of he vision.

The provision for the Sabbatical year was distinctly pre-exilic, since t is given at length in Deut. xv.; yet there is no trace of its observ- nce before the exile, and its non-observance is given by the Chron- cler (2 Chron. xxxvi. 21) as the determining reason for the length of he captivity. We know that it was observed after the restoration 1 Mace. vi. 49; Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10, § 6; Tacitus, *Hist.* lib. v. 2, § 4). Here again is an important and characteristic institution, certainly orming part of the Hebrew legislation before the captivity, neglected ntil that period, and observed afterwards. Exodus (xxiii. 10, 11) nd Leviticus (xxv. 2–7) contain the commands for it, but Ezekiel loes not mention it. He certainly is not in this respect a bridge etween Deuteronomy and Leviticus, betweeen pre- and post-exilic egislation.

The omission of all mention of tithes in Ezekiel, a provision cer- ainly in force from the earliest to the latest times, can only be ccounted for on the supposition of its familiarity.

In the Mosaic law all the males of the people were required to pre- ent themselves at the sanctuary at the great annual festivals (Ex. xxiii. 4, 17; xxxiv. 23; Deut. xvi. 16); there is no such command in Ezekiel, doubtless because it was already entirely familiar. But in xlvi. 9, while speaking of the gate by which the prince shall enter, he incidentally recognizes the custom, "But when the people of the and shall come before the Lord in the solemn feasts," &c. He has nade no provision for this, but recognizes it as a matter of course.

The omission in ch. xliii. is not only very striking in itself, but is of especial importance in its bearing upon the main question under liscussion. In vs. 18–27 a detailed order is given for the seven days consecration of the newly erected altar, at once recalling the similar consecration of the altar in Lev. viii. But in that case the consecra- ion was a double one,—of the altar and of the priests; here the priests are entirely omitted. Why? Evidently because the altar only vas new and required to be consecrated; the priests had been conse- crated of old.

But the question may be asked in regard to the changes of ritual, Why could there not have been deviations by the later priests from he scheme of Ezekiel, just as well as by Ezekiel from the laws of Moses? Simply because there is a good reason for them in one case nd none at all in the other. If Ezekiel wished his description to be

understood ideally, it was important that he should introduce arbitrary variations from the recognized law and custom; but if he intended to set forth a scheme of actual future worship, there is no known reason why his successors should have deviated from it.

Passing now to what may be called the economic, or political features of the vision, there are only three points which call for especial attention, and even these but briefly; the provision for the cost of the sacrifices, the division of the land, and the regulations respecting the prince.

There is no distinct provision in the Mosaic law for defraying the cost of the general sacrifices, and we are told that this was still one of the many questions in dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees at a much later date. But it is fully and clearly settled in Ezekiel's vision. The cost is to be wholly borne by the prince (xliv. 17, 21–26; xlv. 4–7), who is to be provided with ample territorial possessions (xlv. 7, 8; xlviii. 20–22). As far as we have any record, this arrangement was quite new, and it was never followed out. It was, however, so wise and excellent a solution of the difficulty that we can only wonder at its never having been adopted, if any Israelite had ever looked upon this vision as a basis for theocratic legislation.

The division of the land has already been spoken of in connection with the evidence of the ideal character of this vision; but there are one or two other points which require mention. A striking feature of it is the ample provision here made for the prince with the proviso that it shall belong inalienably to him and his sons (xlvi. 17–18); for in connection with this assignment it is said (xlv. 18) "And my princes shall no more oppress my people," and again (xlvi. 18) "the prince shall not take of the people's inheritance by oppression." A vivid remembrance of the exactions and oppressions of former kings was evidently in the prophet's mind, and he provides a new and wise remedy. It was unfortunate for his people that they never thought of making this the basis for actual legislation, and so avoiding once for all the evils under which they continued to suffer.

Another very curious provision is that at the southern end of the "oblation" a strip of land is reserved, 5,000 by 25,000 reeds (xlviii. 15–19), in the midst of which is to be the city with its "suburbs" 5,000 reeds square. The remainder, *i. e.*, two pieces of land, each 5,000 by 10,000 reeds, is set apart that "the increase thereof shall be for food unto them that serve the city. And they that serve the city shall serve it out of all the tribes of Israel." It is quite unnecessary to point out the purely Utopian character of such an arrange-

ment in actual life; it is sufficient to call attention to the fact that neither this nor any other of these economic regulations ever formed a part of the Mosaic law, or were ever in any degree attempted to be carried out.

The law of the tenure of the Levites' land is considerably changed from that of the Mosaic legislation. According to Lev. xxv. 32–34 the Levites might sell their houses and even their cities (only retaining the right of redeeming them at any time, and their reversion in the year of jubilee)—but they might not sell at all the fields of their suburbs. This last provision is here (xlviii. 15) extended to all their landed property in the most emphatic way, and changes the whole tenure of the Levitical land. It is certain that it was never carried into effect, for there never was any such territory assigned to the Levites. It is remarkable that nothing of this kind is mentioned in connection with the priestly territory.

One other particular must be noticed in connection with the division of the land. Under the Mosaic law this was to be wholly parcelled out among the tribes of Israel; and although frequent reference is made to the "sojourning" of strangers among them, no provision is made for allowing them any interest in the soil of the holy land. Ezekiel, on the other hand, expressly commands (xlvii. 22, 23), "Ye shall divide the land by lot for an inheritance unto you and the strangers that sojourn among you, which shall beget children among you; and they shall be unto you as born in the country among the children of Israel; they shall have inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel. And it shall come to pass that in what tribe the stranger sojourneth, there shall ye give him his inheritance." Both these provisions were adapted to their different times: in that of Moses, the land was looked upon as the sole and peculiar possession of the chosen people, and if strangers came among them it should be as "sojourners" only; in the time of Ezekiel matters were greatly changed, and large numbers of foreigners had long had their permanent residence among the tribes of Israel. It is only for these permanent residents "which shall beget children among you" that Ezekiel provides. It is very difficult to suppose that the Mosaic legislation should have been subsequent to his arrangements.

But by far the most important laws of this vision in political matters are those concerning the relation of the prince to the temple worship. A brief mention of these will close this paper. It is plain that under the old theocracy the monarch had no properly ecclesiastical standing. He had great influence of course, either like David in advancing and improving the worship, or like Ahaz in corrupting and

injuring it. But he was not recognized at all in the laws of the Pentateuch except that, in Deut. xvii. 14–20, it is declared that, in case a king should be afterwards desired, his otherwise arbitrary power must be checked by various limitations. Quite in accordance with the supposition of the great antiquity of that legislation, it is found that the monarch never had any other than a purely political position. This obvious fact is certainly very remarkable if the Mosaic law was subsequent to the introduction of the monarchy; indeed it is almost inconceivable that the laws of a theocratic state, if written when there was a monarch upon the throne, and prescribing the duties of all other officers, should take no notice of the monarch himself. But the difficulty is still greater if it could be supposed that these laws were inaugurated or largely developed by Ezekiel who gives such a prominent place in his scheme "to the prince." It is certain that the arrangements here suggested were never carried out, even when such an excellent prince as Zerubbabel was the leader of the restoration. At a subsequent time the offices of prince and priest were indeed combined in the Maccabees, but this was in virtue of their priestly descent and ended with their family; it has nothing to do with the vision of Ezekiel who, while he makes the prince very prominent in his ecclesiastical system, yet assigns to him no priestly functions.

Let what Ezekiel says of "the prince" be carefully noted. His large landed estate, given expressly to prevent oppressive exactions from the people,* and to enable him to furnish all the victims and

---

*In this connection general provision is made (xlv. 10, 11) for just weights and measures among the people. No one can read the passage without observing a connection between it and Lev. xix. 36 and Deut. xxv. 13. The question of priority is indicated by the terms employed. The words used here and in various parts of the Pentateuch are: (1) *Ephah*. This occurs in all ages of Hebrew literature from Exodus to Zechariah. (2) *Homer*, in the sense of a measure, found in the law (3 times), in Isaiah and Hosea (each once), and in Ezekiel (7 times). (3) *Hin*. This is found only in the middle books (Ex.–Num.) of the Pentateuch (16 times) and in Ezekiel (6 times). (4) *Omer*, עֹמֶר, in the sense of measure, in Exodus only (6 times). (5) *Gerah*, in the sense of a measure of value, only in Ex.–Num. (4 times) and in Ezekiel (once). (6) *Bath*, as a measure, does not occur earlier than Kings (twice), Chronicles (3 times), Isaiah (once), but in Ezekiel 7 times. (7) *Cor*. In Kings and Chronicles 7 times, in Ezekiel once. That is to say, all these terms which are used in the law, with the exception of *Omer*, are also used in Ezekiel, while *Hin* and *Gerah* appear to have gone out of use and are found afterwards only in this vision, and *Homer* only elsewhere once each in Isaiah and Hosea; on the other hand, *Bath* and *Cor*, which came into use at a comparatively late date, are not found in the law, but are used by Ezekiel.

other offerings for the national sacrifices, have already been mentioned. Besides these things he is to take a very active and peculiar part in the *cultus* of his people. The east gate of the court of the temple had been, according to this vision, peculiarly sanctified by the entrance through it of the glory of the LORD (xliii.

It may not be amiss to give here a list of other words found only in the Pentateuch and in Ezekiel: טוֹרָשָׁה; בָּפַל; רָשְׁפָּה; טִפַּח; אֹדֶם; אָבִיב; מִין, in the sense of *species*. (Stebbins,—*A Study in the Pentateuch*, p. 169,—has noticed that it occurs in this sense 30 times in the Pentateuch.); מִכְנָסַיִם; מָלַח; מִצְנֶפֶת; נִיחוֹחַ; נִבַּח; נֹקֶד; the word נֶפֶשׁ is a very common one, occurring nearly 800 times, but in the sense of *lower animals* it is found only in the Pentateuch (about 18 times) and in Ezek. xlvii. 9 except once in Isaiah (xix. 10); טוּבְּבוּ (Hoph. part from סָבַב); עֵירֹם; עָגִיל (this occurs 4 times in the Pentateuch and 6 times in Ezekiel; but of the other words for *naked* only עֲרוֹם is found once in the Pentateuch and not at all in Ezekiel, though the more common word in the later books); עַלְמָה, a very peculiar word for darkness; עַרְמוֹן; פֶּטֶר; פֶּרַח; פֶּרֶךְ; פְּרִיחַ; פְּרִי; צָפַע; (kal part. pass.); צֵאָה, a peculiar word for which other derivatives of יָצָא are commonly used; צָוָה in the *Pual*; קָרְבָּן; קָצַע; צֹר; צָמִיד; צִיצִת; צִחַח; (in the Pent. 56 times); קֶרֶשׁ (in the Pent. 50 times); קַשְׁקֶשֶׁת (this occurs also in 1 Sam. xvii. 5 but in a different sense); רָבִיד; רָוָה; תַּחַשׁ; תֶּבֶן. To these should be added such words as occur elsewhere only in passages referring to the Pentateuch, as: מְרִיבָה (3 times in the Ps.); שָׁבַץ (Ps. cv. 30). There are also a number of words found only once elsewhere, as: אָבְלָה, Pent. 7 times, Ezek. 11 times and Jer. xii. 9; בְּהוֹלִים (Judg. xi. 37, 38); מַמְכָּר (Neh. xiii. 20); נִתַּח (Judg. xix. 29); פִּתִּיל (Judg. xvi. 9); שֶׁקֶץ (Isa. lxvi. 17).

The usage of two different words for prince should be noted in this connection: נָשִׂיא occurs 70 times in the Pentateuch, 13 times in Joshua, 34 times in Ezekiel, and only 13 times in all the other books put together; while the more general word for *prince*, נָגִיד (occurring in all 43 times) is used but once in Ezekiel and not at all in the Pentateuch. Delitzsch has noted (Pref. to *The Lev. Priests*, p. xiii., xiv.) that the word כָּפִיר, which occurs elsewhere, is used only in Ex. xxiv. 10; Ezek. i. 26; x. 1 to indicate that blue of the heavens of which there is such rare mention in all antiquity. These instances must be considered numerous enough to establish some connection between the Pentateuch and Ezekiel,—they can hardly be quite independent of each other. The archaisms of the former and the aramaisms of the latter mark their comparative antiquity.

1–7; xliv. 1, 2); in consequence it was to be forever after shut, except for the prince (xliv. 3). He was to enter and go out through it on the Sabbaths and the new moons (xlvi. 1–3), and was to worship at the threshold of this gate while the priests were offering his sacrifices, "the people of the land" meantime worshipping without "at the door of this gate." On these occasions the gate, although not to be used by any one else, is to stand open until the evening. In these cases, when few of the people were expected to be present, the prince seems to have been looked upon as their representative, and it was his duty to be always present and offer the required offerings. When the prince saw fit to offer any "voluntary burnt offering or peace offerings" the same gate was to be opened for him, but immediately shut when he had gone out (*ib.* 12). On occasion of the "solemn feasts," on the other hand, when the mass of the people were expected to be present, the prince was to take his place among them, and to enter "in the midst of them" by the north or south gate, and go out by the opposite one (*ib.* 9, 10).

There is also another provision which puts the prince in the same light of the religious representative of the people. To enable him to furnish the required sacrifices and oblations he is to have not only the large and inalienable landed estate already mentioned, but also is to receive from the whole people regularly a tax in kind of the things required for these purposes. This tax is prescribed in detail in xlv. 13–16, and was to consist of one sixtieth of the grain, one hundredth of the oil, and one two hundredth of the flock. The connection shows that it was to be used by him for supplying the offerings. This is an entire change from both the older and the later custom whereby the people gave directly to the sanctuary, and it again brings forward "the prince" as the representative and embodiment, as it were, of the people in their duties of public worship.

The argument from all this is clear and has already been hinted at. If Ezekiel thus presents the civil ruler as a representative of the people and an important factor in their temple worship, it is simply impossible that any actual legislation, influenced by his vision, should have so totally ignored "the prince" as is notoriously done in the Levitical laws. It would seem that even if the priests and the people had not insisted upon their sovereign's occupying his proper position in their worship, every pious prince would have claimed it for himself. The conclusion is obvious: the Levitical laws are older than Ezekiel, and his vision had no direct effect upon the polity of the Jewish people.

All the more important features of the vision of Ezekiel, so far as

his relation to the Mosaic law is concerned, have now been passed in review. Others, such as the detailed arrangements of his temple, with its various peculiar outbuildings, and its large "precincts," &c., would require too much time to examine in detail, as I have elsewhere done,* and would only add fresh illustrations of the fact which has been everywhere apparent. If we compare the customs of the Jews as they are known after the exile with those which are known to have existed before, they are found perfectly to agree in everything, except negatively in so far as data are wanting to show in some respects what were the customs of the more ancient time. This deficiency was of course to be expected in dealing with matters of such antiquity, where the records we have are almost wholly occupied with other matters. Moreover, both the ancient custom as far as it was regulated by law and can be traced, (making allowance for some small difficulties in understanding such very ancient legislation), and the later practice perfectly agree with the Mosaic legislation. But quite late in the history of Israel, during the captivity in Babylon, the prophet Ezekiel comes forward and in a remarkable vision sets forth a general scheme of theocratic laws and worship. His scheme presents incidentally many obvious allusions to the Levitical laws, but in its direct enactments is quite at variance with both former and later custom and also with the Mosaic law. It is in no sense, and in no point on the line of development from what existed before to what existed afterwards. Yet we are asked to believe that the Levitical law only existed in a very imperfect and inchoate form before him, that he gave the great impetus to its development, and that within 40 years afterwards the nearly perfect scheme was accepted as their ancient law by his nation. The thing required is beyond our power.

*Com. on Ezekiel in Bp. Ellicott's commentary for English readers.

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

Proceedings in June, 1881.

The Society met according to appointment in the Library of the Yale Divinity School, June 2d, 1881, at 2½ P. M.

Present: Profs. Abbot, Beecher, Briggs, Brown, Day, Dwight, Gardiner, Goodwin, Gould, Mitchell, Prentice, Rich, Toy, the Rev. H. Ferguson, Rev. Drs. Harwood and Ward, and subsequently, Prof. George P. Fisher, D. D.

The President having taken the chair, the minutes of the last meeting were read, corrected and approved.

Letters were read from several absent members expressing their regret at their inability to be present, and giving reasons therefor.

Prof. Smith of the Lane Theological Seminary was introduced by Dr. Briggs, and was invited to attend the sessions of the Society.

Several papers printed in the Journal were read and discussed as far as the time allowed, the following business being transacted in the intervals.

Voted: That the final adjournment of this meeting be at 1 P. M. on Friday.

Prof. Dwight invited the Society to meet some gentlemen of New Haven at his house at 8.30 P. M.

The Society expressed their thanks to Prof. Dwight and voted to accept his invitation.

Voted: To take a recess from 6 to 7 P. M.

Voted: That Prof. Abbot be requested to furnish a copy of his paper for publication in full in the proceedings.

Voted: That the matter of issuing a volume of transactions, and the whole subject of printing the papers in general be referred to the council.

The election of officers and the transaction of the general business of the Society was made the order of the day for 7 P. M.

On reassembling after the recess, the council recommended Prof. George P. Fisher, D. D. for membership, and he was unanimously elected.

A committee consisting of Profs. Toy and Brown and Rev. H. Ferguson was appointed on the nomination of officers. This committee subsequently reported the following nominations and the persons so nominated were elected:

Rev. D. R. Goodwin, D. D., LL. D., - - -	*President.*
Rev. James Strong, D. D., - - -	*Vice President.*
Rev. F. Gardiner, D. D., - - - - -	*Secretary.*
Rev. C. A. Briggs, D. D., - - - - -	*Treasurer.*
Rev. Ezra Abbot, D. D., LL. D.,	
Rev. George E. Day, D. D.,	*Additional Members*
Rev. Timothy Dwight, D. D.,	
Prof. Charles Short, LL. D.,	*of the Council.*
Rev. C. M. Mead, Ph. D.,	

The Treasurer presented his report, which was referred to an auditing committee consisting of Drs. Day and Dwight. This committee subsequently reported that "they had compared the vouchers of the Treasurer with the receipts and find them to correspond; and also that the records of receipts and expenditures agree with the summing of the whole as given in the Treasurer's report."

(Signed) George E. Day.

The report was accepted and ordered placed on file.

The Society adjourned to 9 A. M. on Friday, and reassembled at that hour.

On the recommendation of the Council, accompanied by statements in regard to their publications, the following persons were unanimously elected to membership.

Rev. John E. Todd, D. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. Howard Osgood, D. D.,	Rochester, New York.
Rev. Bernard Pick, Ph. D.	Rochester, New York.

The Council appointed the Union Theological Seminary in New York as the place for the next meeting, at such day and hour during the Christmas holidays as may be determined by a committee consisting of Drs. Briggs, Crosby and Short.

A tribute was paid to the memory of our deceased colleague, the Rev. E. A. Washburn, D. D., by the Rev. Dr. Harwood. After

further remarks by other members, a committee, consisting of Drs. Harwood, Goodwin, and Abbot, was appointed to prepare a minute in relation to the deceased, to be entered in our printed proceedings. This committee prepared the following minute:

It has pleased Almighty God, in His wise providence, to remove from the membership of this Society our brother, the late Edward A. Washburn, Doctor in Divinity. In his death the Church and the community have met with a serious loss. Dr. Washburn was keenly interested in the formation and in the purposes and work of this Society: for he saw that one of the weaknesses and evils of the Church of this present day is the wide spread ignorance of the Sacred Scriptures among even the commissioned preachers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Hence he hailed every movement for the intellectual enlightenment of the clergy with chivalrous ardor and a generous hospitality. This inspired him with zeal in the department of sacred criticism and philology, while he served none the less the cause of dogmatic theology when and where all interest in it seemed threatened with lethargy, if not with extinction. Dr. Washburn's personal sympathies, his bright intelligence, his brave support of every movement for the increase of the knowledge of the faith that is in Christ, made him a valued and valuable member of every society of Christian men with which he was associated, and we, in common with many others, deeply deplore his loss and regret his death in the fullness of his hopes and powers.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWIN HARWOOD,

In behalf of a Special Committee.

The questions on the admissibility of papers opposing the conclusions of papers previously read, and of limiting the length of discussions, were considered and a general understanding on both subjects was reached.

Voted: That the thanks of the Society be returned to the New Haven committee of arrangements for the use of the room, and for their provision for the comfort of the members.

After the reading of the rough minutes, the Society adjourned.

FREDERIC GARDINER,

Secretary.

Proceedings in December, 1881.

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis met in the Chapel of the Union Theological Seminary, 9 University Place, New York, according to appointment, at 10 A. M., Dec. 29th, 1881.

There were present Profs. E. Abbot, C. A. Briggs, Francis Brown, H. A. Buttz, Rev. T. W. Chambers, Pres. Thomas Chase, Profs. Geo. E. Day, F. Gardiner, D. R. Goodwin, I. H. Hall, Rev. R. D. Hitchcock, Profs. C. M. Mead, H. G. T. Mitchell, Howard Osgood, John A. Paine, P. Schaff, Charles Short, James Strong, and Henry R. Weston.

The chair was taken at the opening by the Vice-President.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The Council in the course of the meeting recommended the following persons, and they were thereupon duly elected as members of the Society:

Prof. C. I. H. Ropes,	Bangor, Maine.
Prof. R. D. Hitchcock, D. D.,	9 University Place, New York.
Rev. S. M. Jackson,	42 Bible House, New York.
Prof. Geo. McI. Du Bois,	Cor. Walnut and 39th Sts., Philadelphia.
Prof. J. T. Beckwith, Ph. D.,	Hartford, Conn.
Rev. Canon Maurice Baldwin,	Montreal, Canada.
Prof. Samuel Hart,	Hartford, Conn.
Rev. E. W. Rice,	1122 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.
Prof. H. P. Smith,	Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati.
Prof. L. I. Evans, D. D.,	Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati.
Prof. S. Ives Curtiss, Ph. D.,	364 W. Washington St., Chicago.

Various letters from absent members were read.

The President arrived and took the chair.

The first paper, "Remarks on Rom. ix. 5," was read by Prof. E. Abbot at 10:45 A. M., and was discussed until 1 P. M., when a recess was taken until 2:30 P. M.

After the recess, some time was occupied in the election of the members recommended by the Council.

At 2:55 P. M. the second paper was read by Prof. D. R. Goodwin, "On the use of ψυχή, πνεῦμα and connected words in the sacred writings." (This paper is printed at the beginning of the Journal for December, as being a part of the last paper at the June meeting.) This paper was discussed until 4:05 P. M.

After discussion it was voted: that papers whose authors are not present shall go to the foot of the list; and that in case the authors are not heard from for two consecutive meetings, the Secretary shall enquire if they wish to have their papers continued.

A statement was made by the Treasurer.

Voted: that the Secretary be requested to enquire of those who have not paid their initiation fee or their assessments for two years whether they wish to be considered members of the Society.

At 4:17 the next paper was read by Prof. C. M. Mead, "An Examination of Ex. xxxiii. 7–11," and was discussed until 5:25.

At 5:25 the fourth paper was read by Rev. Dr. Chambers, "On Everlasting Father in Isa. ix. 6, 7," and was discussed until the recess.

At 5:50 the Society took a recess until 7:30.

On reassembling after the recess the Council announced the place and time of the next meeting as New Haven during the first week of June, the day, hour and place to be fixed by a committee consisting of Drs. Day, Dwight and Harwood.

At 7:40 the last paper was read by Prof. F. Gardiner, "On Ezekiel in relation to the Levitical law," and was discussed until 9:40.

The rough minutes of the meeting were then read, and the Society adjourned.

FREDERIC GARDINER, Secretary.

The following papers were not read and stand over to the next meeting:

On the Syriac Apocalypse. By Prof. I. H. Hall, Ph. D.

On the interpretation of Gen. xlix. 10. By President S. C. Bartlett, D. D.

An exegesis of the reference to the potter and the clay in Rom. ix. 21. By Chancellor Howard Crosby, LL. D.

A critical examination of 1 Tim. iv. 1–5. By Rev. E. R. Craven, D. D.

A neglected argument for the Apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel. By Prof. Geo. Prentice, D. D.

On ברא in Josh xvii. 15, 18, and Ezek. xxi. 24; xxiii. 47. By Willis J. Beecher, D. D.

On the Hebrew tenses in conditional clauses. By Rev. H. Ferguson.

On Job xix. 26. By Rev. J. I. Mombert, D. D.

Notes on the book of Tobit. By Prof. C. H. Toy, D. D.

On discoveries in Palestine. By Prof. Selah Merrill, D. D.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

Prof. Ezra Abbot, D.D., LL.D.,	23 Berkeley St., Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. Canon Maurice Baldwin,	Montreal, Canada.
President S. C. Bartlett, D. D.,	Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Prof. J. T. Beckwith, Ph. D.,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.,	Auburn, N. Y.
Prof. John Binney,	Middletown, Conn.
Prof. C. A. Briggs, D. D.,	Union Theol. Seminary, New York.
Prof. Francis Brown,	9 University Place, New York.
*Rev. J. K. Burr, D. D.,	Trenton, N. J.
Prof. J. H. Buttz, D. D.,	Madison, N. J.
President W. C. Cattell, D. D.,	Lafayette College, Easton, Penn.
Rev. T. W. Chambers, D. D.,	70 West 36th St., New York.
President Thos. Chase, LL. D.,	Haverford Col., Delaware Co., Penn.
Prof. T. J. Conant, D. D.,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Chan'r Howard Crosby, LL. D.,	116 East 19th St., New York.
Rev. Elijah R. Craven, D. D.,	Newark, N. J.
Prof. S. Ives Curtiss, Ph. D.,	364 West Washington St., Chicago, Ill.
Prof. George E. Day, D. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. John De Witt, D. D.,	Theol. Sem. of Ref'd Dutch Church, New Brunswick, N. J.
Prof. Timothy Dwight, D. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. Geo. McI. Du Bois,	Cor. Walnut and 39th Sts., Philadelphia.
Prof. L. I. Evans, D. D.,	Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Rev. Henry Ferguson,	Claremont, N. H.
Prof. Geo. P. Fisher, D. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. F. Gardiner, D. D.,	Middletown, Conn.
Prof. D. R. Goodwin, D. D., LL. D.,	3927 Locust St., Philadelphia.
Prof. E. P. Gould,	Newton Theol. Sem., Newton, Mass.
Prof. Isaac H. Hall, Ph. D.,	Office of *S. S. Times*, Philadelphia.
Prof. Samuel Hart,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. C. D. Hartranft, D. D.,	Hartford, Conn. (Box 524)

*Died in April, 1882.

Rev. E. Harwood, D. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. R. D. Hitchcock, D. D.,	9 University Place, New York.
Rev. S. M. Jackson,	42 Bible House, New York.
Prov't C. P. Krauth, LL. D.,	Univ. of Pa., Philadelphia.
Prof. C. M. Mead, Ph. D.,	Andover, Mass.
Prof. Selah Merrill, D. D.,	Andover, Mass.
Prof. H. G. T. Mitchell, Ph. D.,	Middletown, Conn.
Rev. J. I. Mombert, D. D.,	Passaic, N. J.
Prof. Howard Osgood, D. D.,	Rochester, New York.
Prof. John A. Paine, Ph. D.,	Tarrytown, N. Y.
Rev. Bernard Pick, Ph. D.,	Rochester, N. Y.
Prof. George Prentice, D. D.,	Middletown, Conn.
Rev. E. W. Rice,	1122 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.
Prof. Thomas H. Rich,	Bates College, Lewiston, Me.
Prof. M. B. Riddle,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. C. I. H. Ropes,	Bangor, Me.
Prof. P. Schaff, D. D.,	42 Bible House, New York.
Prof. Charles Short, LL. D.,	24 West 60th St., New York.
Prof. H. P. Smith,	Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Prof. P. H. Steenstra,	Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. James Strong, D. D.,	Madison, N. J.
Prof. J. H. Thayer, D. D.,	Andover, Mass.
Rev. John E. Todd, D. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. C. H. Toy, D. D.,	Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, D. D.,	37 East 35th St., New York.
Rev. W. H. Ward, D. D.,	Office of *Independent*, New York.
Prof. Henry R. Weston, D. D.,	Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Penn.

2084